



The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project

Roselyne Chroman Swig

PRESIDENT, JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION OF SAN FRANCISCO,
THE PENINSULA, MARIN AND SONOMA COUNTIES, 1992-1994

With Introductions by
Phyllis Cook
Naomi Lauter
and
Alan E. Rothenberg

Interviews Conducted by
Eleanor K. Glaser
in 1995 and 1996

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral history is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is indexed, bound with photographs and illustrative materials, and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and Roselyne C. Swig dated August 20, 1996. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Bancroft Library, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley 94720-6000, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Roselyne C. Swig requires that she be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Roselyne Chroman Swig, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1992-1994, an oral history conducted in 1995 and 1996 by Eleanor K. Glaser, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2001.

Copy no. 1



Roselyne C. Swig, 1992.

Photo by Michael Jang.

Cataloguing information

SWIG, Roselyne Chroman (b. 1930)

Jewish community leader

President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1992-1994, 2001, xii, 171 pp.

Family and schooling, Chicago and Los Angeles, UCLA, UC Berkeley; marriage to Richard Swig, 1950; San Francisco-based Jewish Community Federation: board member and president of Jewish Vocational Services, Women's Division (president, 1970-1972), Federation campaign chair, 1984, president, 1992-1994; discusses disputes with Jewish Agency, involvement with Israel; organization memberships and awards; starting Artsource, and term as Clinton-appointed director of Art in Embassy Program, U.S. State Department.

Introductions by Phyllis Cook, Jewish Community Federation; Naomi Lauter, National Community Consultant, AIPAC; and Alan E. Rothenberg, Past President, Jewish Community Federation.

Interviewed 1995-1996 by Eleanor K. Glaser for the Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project. Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

The Regional Oral History Office would like to express its thanks to the Jewish Community Endowment Fund of The Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties. Their encouragement and support have made possible the Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Roselyne Chroman Swig

PREFACE	i
INTRODUCTION by Phyllis Cook	v
INTRODUCTION by Naomi Lauter	vi
INTRODUCTION by Alan Rothenberg	vii
INTERVIEW HISTORY by Eleanor K. Glaser	ix
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	xii
I EARLY YEARS, BORN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JUNE 8, 1930	1
Recollections of Family	1
Schooling	4
Move to Los Angeles	5
College Years	5
II MARRIAGE TO RICHARD SWIG, FEBRUARY, 1950	9
Responsibilities as Wife, Mother, and Hostess	9
III EARLY COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	11
Mount Zion Hospital, Good Will Industries	11
Children's Schools	12
IV WOMEN'S DIVISION	13
A Comfortable Place	13
Educational Programs	14
Fundraising	15
President, 1970-1972	16
Group Dynamics Program	17
Federation's View of Women's Division	17
A Change in National Structure	18
V ENTRY INTO FEDERATION	19
Budget Committee	19
Chairman, Jewish Vocational Service	20
VI FEDERATION ASSIGNMENTS	21
Louis Weintraub Replaced by Brian Lurie	21
Call for Changes in Management of Jewish Agency and United Jewish Appeal	22
Amuta	23
Federation Versus Jewish Agency	23
VII FEDERATION TRANSITIONS	26
Campaign Chairman, 1985	26
Training for Leadership	27

Project Renewal	28
Amuta	30
A Sense of Achievement	31
 VIII ISRAEL	
Concern for the Future	35
Overseas Committee	35
Project Renewal and the Jewish Agency	36
Partnership 2000	38
Diaspora Concerns	39
Operation Solomon and Operation Exodus	39
OTZMA	41
Allocation of Funds--Local Needs Versus Israel	42
Underwriting Loan Guarantees	45
Mega Mission to Israel, 1991	46
Family Involvement	48
 IX THE FEDERATION AND THE COMMUNITY	
Demographic Study Approved, 1985	51
Strategic Planning Committee, 1988	52
 X FEDERATION PRESIDENT, 1992-1994	
President-Elect	56
Staffing	56
Perceiving a Need for Change	57
Federation Endowment Fund	61
KQED	62
 XI A NEW FEDERATION EXECUTIVE	
Wayne Feinstein	64
Reaction to Report from Federation Retreat	65
 XII TRIP TO UZBEKISTAN	
United Jewish Appeal Mission	69
 XIII A CALL FOR CHANGE	
Unmet Needs of Agencies	72
The Mature Agency	72
Community Needs	73
 XIV FEDERATION AND WOMEN'S ISSUES	
An Issue to be Addressed	76
Partners Ending Domestic Abuse	78
First Jewish Women's Conference	79
 XV MORE ON PRESIDENCY	
A Period of Change	82
Jewish Continuity	82
 XVI CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS	
Possible Merger of Council of Jewish Federations, United	85
Jewish Appeal, and the Jewish Agency	85

XVII	MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS	88
	National Vice President, Western Region, State of Israel Bonds	88
	Vice President, Board of Trustees, Jewish Community Museum	88
	Washington Action Office, Council of Jewish Federations	88
	International Board of Governors, Tel Aviv Museum of Art	89
	Director, National Womens Division and Member of National Board of Directors, United Jewish Appeal	89
	National Vice President, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)	89
	National Commission on Jewish Continuity	90
	Joint Distribution Committee	90
XVIII	ACTIVITIES IN GREATER COMMUNITY	92
	Roselyne C. Swig Artsource	92
	Director, Art in Embassies Program, U.S. Department of State	94
	Board Member, San Francisco Opera Association	96
	Vice Chairman, Fine Arts Advisory Committee, Federal Reserve Board, Chairman, 2001	97
	Art Table	98
	Board Member, California State Summer School for the Arts	99
	Board Member, American Council for the Arts	99
	Member, San Francisco Public Library Commission	100
	Boards of Local Art Institutions	100
	Trustee, UC Berkeley Foundation	101
	Trustee, Mills College	102
	Member, California Insurance Commissioner's Advisory Board	103
	Member, Governor's Advisory Board, California-Israel Exchange	104
	San Francisco Foundation, Special Awards Committee	104
	Local Liaison, Foreign Diplomatic Travel Program	105
	Awards	105
XIX	A SUMMING UP	108
	Ideas for Federation's Future	108
	Satisfaction in Career and Volunteer Activity	109
TAPE GUIDE		
APPENDIX		
	Postscript by Roselyne Swig	111
	Roselyne Chroman Swig curriculum vitae	118
	Memo, August 15, 1969	122
	Women's Division, list of presidents and campaign chairmen, n.d. [probably 1972]	123
	Social Scene, <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , June 22, 1972	124
	"Report on Status of Implementation of Strategic Plan," March 1992	125
	"Cissie Swig, in conversation with Mandy Behbehani," <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> , September 13, 1992	131
	"Roselyne C. Swig Report to the JCF Board Trip to Tashkent and Samarkand, Uzbekistan, FSU," October, 1993	134
	"Riding on the Crest of Change," A Special Report by Roselyne C. Swig, President, to the Jewish Community Federation	

Membership, for the Annual Meeting, June 16, 1994	139
"JCF Speech," JCF Annual Meeting, June 16, 1994	156
"Cissie Swig, outgoing JCF head, joins Clinton team,"	
<i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , June 17, 1994	164
<i>The American Benefactor</i> (partial article), Spring 1997	165
"Patriarch Richard Swig: 'He was just larger than life',"	
<i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , October 3, 1997	166
"Russian Jews now have a cultural home as well," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , June 4, 1998	168
"Roselyn[e] 'Cissie' Swig tapped for U.S.-Israel commission,"	
<i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , December 8, 2000	169
INDEX	170

PREFACE

The Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project was initiated in 1990, under the sponsorship of the Jewish Community Endowment Fund, to record the recent history of the Jewish Welfare Federation. Through oral histories with the sixteen living past presidents and two past executives of the Federation, the project seeks to document Jewish philanthropy in the West Bay as spearheaded by the Federation during the past half-century.

The Jewish community can take pride in the manner in which it has, through the years, assumed the traditional Jewish role of providing for the less fortunate. Organized Jewish philanthropy in San Francisco began in 1850 with the Eureka Benevolent Association, today's Jewish Family and Children's Service Agency. With the organization in 1910 of the Federation of Jewish Charities, the community took the major step of coordinating thirteen separate social service agencies. The funding of local services was absorbed by the Community Chest when the Federation affiliated with it in 1922. Soon thereafter, the need was seen for an organization to support the financial needs of national and overseas agencies. This led to the formation of the Jewish National Welfare Fund in 1925, which pioneered in conducting a single annual campaign for Jewish needs outside of San Francisco. The Federation of Jewish Charities and the Jewish National Welfare Fund merged in 1955, becoming the Jewish Welfare Federation, the forerunner of the present Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties.

This oral history project was conceived by Phyllis Cook, executive director of the Jewish Community Endowment Fund, and Eleanor Glaser, the oral historian who had just completed the oral history of Sanford M. Treguboff, the late executive director of the Federation. They realized that 1990 would be the thirty-fifth year of the Jewish Welfare Federation and that it was none too soon to try to capture the insights and experiences of the Federation's first presidents. Not only would these leaders be able to document the dynamic history of the Federation, but they could link that to the activities of several other agencies since all had prepared themselves for their services as Federation president by working in one or another capacity in the earlier Jewish charitable institutions.

Thus, it was anticipated that through the recollections of these Federation presidents it might be also possible to understand the driving motivations and principles of those pioneer leaders and the forces they dealt with during the building of the Bay Area Jewish community.

Phyllis Cook, in consultation with the board of directors of the Jewish Community Endowment Fund, worked with the Regional Oral History Office of The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, to carry out the project. Direction of the project was assumed by Eleanor Glaser, the office research editor for Jewish history subjects.

In the oral history process the interviewer works closely with the memoirist in the preliminary research and in setting up topics for discussion. For the Federation project, Eleanor Glaser conducted extensive research in the Federation Board minutes in order to determine critical events, committee assignments, and the pressing needs during each president's term of office. The interviews are informal conversations that are tape recorded, transcribed, edited by the interviewer for continuity and clarity, checked and approved by the interviewee, and then final typed. The oral history manuscripts are open to research in libraries nationwide. Copies of the Federation project oral histories will be available in the Federation Library; The Bancroft Library; the Department of Special Collections, Library, UCLA; and in other libraries interested in collecting source material on this subject.

Sam Ladar, president of the Jewish Welfare Federation in 1965 and 1966, was the first interviewee. As the initial oral history for the project, general Federation information such as early board minutes, lists of officers, etc., have been included in the Ladar volume. Researchers are advised to start there.

The Regional Oral History Office was established in 1954 to record the lives of persons who have contributed significantly to the history of California and the West. The Office is administered by The Bancroft Library. Over the years the Office has documented a number of leaders in the California Jewish community. The Office is honored to have this opportunity to document Jewish philanthropy in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Eleanor Glaser, Project Director
Jewish Community Federation Leadership
Oral History Project

Willa Baum, Division Head
Regional Oral History Office

December 1996
Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project
Series List

Jerome Braun, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1979-1980, 1995

Annette R. Dobbs, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1988-1990, 1999

Jesse Feldman, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1973-1974, 1991

Frances D. Green, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1975-1976, 1996

Richard N. Goldman, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1981-1982, 1993

Peter E. Haas, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1977-1978, 1994

Douglas M. Heller, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1994-1996, 1998

Ronald Kaufman, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1984-1986, 1998

Samuel A. Ladar, A Reflection on the Early Years of the San Francisco Jewish Community Federation, 1990

William J. Lowenberg, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1983-1984, 1995

Brian Lurie, Former Executive Director, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1974-1991, 1997

Laurence E. Myers, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1986-1988, 1993

Alan E. Rothenberg, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1996-1998, 2000

Donald Seiler, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1990-1992, 1998

Robert E. Sinton, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1967-1968, 1991

*John H. Steinhart, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco,
the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1969-1970, 1992*

*Melvin M. Swig, President, Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the
Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1971-1972, 1992*

*Roselyne Chroman Swig, President, Jewish Community Federation of San
Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 1992-1994*

*Louis E. Weintraub, Administration of the San Francisco Jewish Welfare
Federation, 1970-1975, 1996*

INTRODUCTION by Phyllis Cook

It is a great pleasure to be able to write some words of introduction to Cissie's oral history. There are comments to be made that she would never make herself.

Cissie's leadership has a necessary characteristic for success in leading others. She is an upbeat optimist. She approaches the most complex challenges with a "can-do" attitude that never wavers. Her tenure as president involved trying to obtain a large piece of real estate to house all of the local Jewish agencies. It was difficult, requiring complex political negotiations. Cissie was forthright and fearless as she has been in many issues in which she has been called upon to step forth, often in behalf of the Jewish community.

Cissie was always expansive in extending warm hospitality in reaching out to host the community in her home on so many countless occasions. This warmth and generous spirit caused many issues to be resolved and projects to be supported by the very ambiance that Cissie created in bringing all parts of the community together over and over in her living room.

A wise person once defined real intelligence as the ability to make the right "connections." Cissie spends every day in connecting people who should know each other due to shared interests.

Her passionate pride in her Jewish identity has been a model for others. The Jewish community has been fortunate in having one who has cared more than others perhaps thought was wise; who was willing to risk more than others might have thought was safe; and who was always expecting more than others might have thought was possible.

Phyllis Cook
Jewish Community Federation

February, 2001
San Francisco

INTRODUCTION by Naomi Lauter

I have known Cissie for fifty-two years and have watched her in awe. She raised four children, has always been a remarkable wife and homemaker, and took an astounding leadership role in the San Francisco and national Jewish communities.

She has always joined her total devotion to the Jewish community with the wider San Francisco community to which she belongs. From battered women and the visual art world to KQED and Mills College, she has served the general community. But her true passion and pull is to serve the Jewish world. Her love for Israel is profound. As Federation president, she and her husband Richard led a Mega-Mission to Israel, just weeks after the Iraq war in 1991. The leadership that she showed to the more than 300 people was superb.

Whatever needs doing, she does, seemingly effortlessly. There are countless times when she has been asked to serve and she has. I am familiar with only some of them. When the survivor community wanted to build a Holocaust memorial, she was asked to serve on the committee. Cissie, along with Bill Lowenberg and Rhoda Goldman, were the driving forces. When KQED needed an outspoken Jewish voice on its board, she joined the board and again became a leader. She served the city on the Art Commission. When she realized how important it was for every citizen to be involved in the political life of our country, she became very involved. She held countless events in her home for people running for office. She served President Clinton as the director of Art in the Embassy, leaving her comfortable life in San Francisco for Washington. Recognizing the importance of Jewish political action, she became active in AIPAC, again rising to the top as a leader.

She is never satisfied with her knowledge, so she is always reading and learning. Most recently, she went to Israel and studied with Rabbi David Hartman for a month.

She is the mother of four and the grandmother of twelve. She derives tremendous pleasure from her family. You can find her jogging with her eighteen-year-old grandson, or celebrating Succot in her garden with a few granddaughters. And when each grandchild reaches thirteen, you will catch her in Israel instilling her love for the Jewish people in them.

Through all this, Cissie has time to enjoy life to the fullest and always takes time out to smell the roses.

Naomi Lauter
National Community Consultant, AIPAC

October, 2000
San Francisco

INTRODUCTION by Alan E. Rothenberg

Roselyne Swig, known to her legions of friends and admirers as "Cissie," has been a force to be reckoned with in San Francisco since her arrival here in 1950 as the bride of her late husband, Richard. What San Francisco didn't know when Cissie moved to town was the enormous benefit that our city would gain by her residency. Working with Cissie on numerous committees at the Jewish Community Federation over a twenty-year span, I learned the true meaning of leadership.

While the pages that follow will describe in eloquent detail Cissie's numerous activities on behalf of the community, both Jewish and civic, what will probably not be said is how her legendary skills of charm and negotiation have won many a battle, as well as the hearts and minds of Bay Area residents.

Cissie has always practiced something akin to "frontier justice." This is a vague Western notion of doing what's right at the moment, sometimes with your wallet, sometimes with a rope, and sometimes with a barn burning party. For Cissie, frontier justice has come to mean dealing with any problem she came across, whether it was someone in need, a wrong that needed righting, or some global or national trend that she felt was misguided. She simply sets her mind, heart, and pocketbook to defeating that which she feels is evil, and aids that which she feels is beneficial. Cissie never quits. She is always focused on how to get people interested in things that matter to her and should matter to them, and she works twenty-four hours a day toward that end.

One of the great masters of event planning, Cissie has often used the art of entertainment as a way to gather together those whom she thought would be beneficial to a cause. When looking around a table at one of Cissie's events, it always looks like a very casual arrangement, but this is never the case. Even on our tour in Israel, Cissie "entertains." A never-empty box of homemade cookies appears on buses in Israel, whether we are touring central Jerusalem or the Lebanese border. Though Cissie had been on the road for a week or two, it would seem as if she had been up all night baking fresh cookies in order for us to have a proper midday snack. In fact, most of these cookies had come from home in one of Cissie's suitcases, but she was always the eternal mother, wanting everyone to be happy, well fed, and content. Cissie knows that when people are having a good time, they are better able to focus on the real purpose of a trip, which is undoubtedly a serious subject.

Another side of the Cissie we all know and appreciate is her caring for those around her. I remember in particular one break-the-

fast meal following Yom Kippur. It was a lovely evening, and I was talking with Cissie on her deck, watching the sun go down. Suddenly Cissie noticed, in the far corner of her living room, someone's ten-year-old daughter with a serious pout on her face--someone who was clearly having a very unpleasant time. In a nanosecond, Cissie was across the room sitting next to the young girl, first charming her and then engaging her in hilarious laughter. Cissie then determined an appropriate role for this young girl in the fabric of the evening so she could become engaged in a task which would fill her evening with purpose and meaning.

San Francisco, and particularly its Jewish community, has been blessed by Cissie's wisdom, by her determination, and by her refusal to ignore things which she did not feel were right. Our lives would all be much darker were it not for Cissie's light, her sharing of what is good, and her insistence that we all join her in defeating what is dark or evil. The enclosed pages can hardly do justice to a woman of such talents, but know before you start that whatever is mentioned here barely scratches the surface of the contribution that Cissie has made to our world.

Alan E. Rothenberg
Past President, Jewish Community
Federation

September, 2000
San Francisco

INTERVIEW HISTORY by Eleanor Glaser

Roselyne Chroman Swig (known to all as Cissie) is deeply committed to her family, to her Jewish traditions, and to Israel--she takes each of her twelve grandchildren to Israel when they reach bar or bat mitzvah age. These commitments, together with discussions about her career in art, plus her community and political involvement, are recounted in her oral history. This memoir is part of the Jewish Community Leadership Oral History Project underwritten by the Jewish Community Endowment Fund to record the history of the Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties. Mrs. Swig, president of the Federation from 1992 to 1994, is the sixteenth past president interviewed for this series, which also includes two past executive directors.

Cissie Swig is a slim, tastefully dressed, youthful woman, whose appearance belies her being a grandmother--a role she obviously relishes. Given her interest and expertise in art, in 1978 she founded an art consulting business, Roselyne C. Swig Artsource.

Our first meeting was held on August 16, 1995, in Cissie's office in a narrow building on Belden Place, a lane occupied by a number of restaurants. The taping of the interview was disrupted several times by loud noises from the two major streets bordering the lane. The office reflected Cissie's personal and professional taste in art. Its white walls were an excellent setting for the many abstract paintings displayed. One wall was covered with shelves containing art volumes, and unusual sculptures were also to be seen. This was the office of a woman interested in many aspects of the visual arts.

Several hours following our interview, Cissie was scheduled to fly to Montana and Wyoming to view the work of artists living in that area. At that time, she was the director of the U.S. State Department's Art in Embassies Program, which she described as borrowing the art of American artists, "from individuals and institutions, museums, foundations, galleries, corporations, the artists themselves, and collectors." The artwork is placed in the residences of U.S. ambassadors abroad to "showcase the art accomplishments of our country's artists."

The directorship was a political appointment, and upon assuming her government position, Cissie sold her art consulting business to her three associates. She also relinquished her position on the national executive board of AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee).

Cissie resided in Washington, D.C., for three years, and attempts were made to schedule further interviews when she might be in San Francisco between her travel and speaking engagements. But this didn't

seem to be possible. For example, a November 1995 interview was postponed because Cissie was momentarily expecting the birth of a grandchild. When her husband, Richard, became seriously ill, Cissie resigned her government position and returned to San Francisco. During his convalescence, three interviews were conducted in August, 1996. Unfortunately, Richard Swig never regained his health and died on September 25, 1997.

In our first interview in 1995, Cissie talked about her activities in the Women's Division of the Federation, in which she served as campaign chairman in 1967 and president in 1970-1972. When we resumed with the three 1996 interviews, her office was at a different location but was still filled with art. In these subsequent interviews, Cissie discussed her various Federation positions. She stated that her greatest sense of achievement came from participating in the Federation's Project Renewal and the overseas committee and from Shalom 91, the mega mission she co-chaired with her husband. These activities served to connect the Federation to Israel, and they are indicative of Cissie's strong commitment to Israel. She and her husband first went there in the 1960s, and she has gone to Israel every year since. She said, "There have been times when I've gone three times a year."

When Cissie Swig became Federation president in 1992, she was the third woman to serve in that position. One of her goals as president was to bring about a closer relationship with synagogues, which was part of her emphasis on community development. Another activity important to her was getting the executive staffs of all Federation agencies together on a regular basis, meeting for lunch to discuss their problems and progress. Cissie wanted the Federation to be more innovative and wished it would take on women's issues and domestic abuse, but her efforts were not successful.

During her administration, Cissie had the difficult task of dealing with the Federation's \$1.5 million deficit. But it was also during her presidency that the Federation was given the William J. Shroeder Award for its innovative approach for serving college youth. Another pleasure was witnessing the signing of the Israel-Palestine Accord in Washington, D.C., on September 13, 1993.

Someone who worked closely with Cissie said of her Federation presidency: "Cissie makes people feel good. She has an ambassadorial presence, a graciousness, a warmth. She added a dimension that some other people couldn't; she personalized the Federation."

The edited transcript of her four interviews was sent to Cissie early in 1997, and in June, 1999, at her request we met at her home to confer about the editing of the manuscript. When she returned the manuscript, we found she had carefully reviewed it, making changes in a number of places to clarify her meaning. In addition, because Cissie

was in Washington for three years, she felt she hadn't had the opportunity or time to review her Federation papers, and so the interviews didn't have as much content as she would have liked. Cissie therefore wrote an addendum to cover her lengthy years of service to the Federation. This material is included in the appendix of her volume.

At Cissie's request, three people were asked to write an introduction for her memoir: Phyllis Cook, Naomi Lauter, and Alan Rothenberg. The cooperation of these busy people is very much appreciated.

The Regional Oral History Office was established in 1954 to augment through tape-recorded memoirs the Library's materials on the history of California and the West. Copies of all interviews are available for research use in The Bancroft Library and in the UCLA Department of Special Collections. The office is under the direction of Ann Lage, Acting Division Head, and the administrative direction of Charles B. Faulhaber, James D. Hart Director of The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Eleanor K. Glaser, Interviewer/Editor

February 2001
Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

(Please write clearly. Use black ink.)

Your full name ROSELYNE CHARMAN SWIG

Date of birth JUNE 8 1930 Birthplace CHICAGO, ILL

Father's full name IRVING NATHAN CHARMAN

Occupation BUSINESSMAN Birthplace KASHELSK, POLAND

Mother's full name TILLIE LEVINSON CHARMAN

Occupation HOUSEWIFE Birthplace BUKAREST, ROMANIA

Your spouse RICHARD LEWIS SWIG

Occupation BUSINESS EXECUTIVE Birthplace BOSTON, MASS

Your children RICHARD LEWIS SWIG JR., SUSY, BRIAN WATKINS

CHARLOTTE SWIG, CAROL SWIG SEDAKA

Where did you grow up? CHICAGO, ILL / LOS ANGELES, CA

Present community SAN FRANCISCO / WASHINGTON DC

Education 3 yrs. University, UC Berkeley

Occupation(s) ART CONSULTANT DIR, ART IN MEMPHIS

CERTIFIED STONE

Areas of expertise ART, COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER, FUNDRAISING

Other interests or activities POLITICS, WOMEN'S ISSUES, SPORTS

TELEVISION ISSUES

Organizations in which you are active

INTERVIEW WITH ROSELYNE C. SWIG

I EARLY YEARS, BORN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JUNE 8, 1930

[Interview 1: August 16, 1995] #1

Recollections of Family

Glaser: Cissie, would you tell me the date and place of your birth?

Swig: June 8, 1930, Chicago, Illinois.

Glaser: Did you have siblings?

Swig: I have two sisters, two years younger and two years older.

Glaser: Please you tell me about your parents.

Swig: Both of my parents were born in Europe. My mother came here when she was two; my father came here when he was seventeen, I think. My father came from Nasheltsk in Poland, and my mother came from Romania. I would imagine it was Bucharest, I'm not sure.

Glaser: Did you know your grandparents?

Swig: I knew one grandparent, my mother's father.

Glaser: What was his name?

Swig: Jacob.

Glaser: And his last name?

Swig: Levinson.

Glaser: Did they live near you?

^{1##} This symbol indicates that a tape or tape segment has begun or ended. A guide to the tapes follows the transcript.

Swig: Yes, we were a very, very close family. My mother's sisters and my father's brothers lived in Chicago. My mother and one of her sisters married my father and one of his brothers. [laughter]

Glaser: Oh, interesting. Where in Chicago did you live?

Swig: South Side. In fact, until we moved to California we lived on the South Side.

Glaser: What was your father's business?

Swig: He had real estate.

Glaser: Were your mother and father involved in the Jewish community?

Swig: They were. My mother more so. She was more involved in the organizational aspects of it. I don't recall my father being so active, but I think he was involved in the brotherhood of our shul.

Glaser: Did you have religious education, and was the family observant?

Swig: We had Hebrew school up until I was twelve. My father wouldn't allow us to be bat mitzvah, but we had Hebrew school.

Glaser: Was it because you were not Reform that he didn't want you to be bat mitzvah?

Swig: We were Orthodox, then Conservative. My mother kept kosher, and then she stopped before we moved from the neighborhood that I remember as a very little child. We were involved in a synagogue that was a shul. I took Hebrew lessons there, but it would not have condoned bat mitzvah.

Glaser: Did you have relatives in Europe during Holocaust? Was the family involved?

Swig: No. I never remember any discussion about the Holocaust, never.

Glaser: Were there political discussions within your home when you were growing up?

Swig: Political discussions on a socialist level, but not to any extent that my parents were active participants. But I remember a lot of discussion about Workmen's Circle, which I think was either communist or socialist.

Glaser: I think socialist, yes.

Swig: Yes. The Workmen's Circle was quite active, in fact, in the Midwest. It had children's camps. But that's the only political thing that I remember, and at the time I didn't even think about it.

Glaser: If your father came from Europe, then he probably didn't start out right away in real estate.

Swig: No, no. When he came from Europe, he was concerned about bringing over his brothers. He was the son that came first, and then brought his brothers. You know, I really don't know what he did before that. I'm trying to think of what my--. I had an uncle that was involved in a small retail business, so maybe there was that. But honest to gosh, I don't remember. All I can remember of my father is that he owned the building that we lived in with his brothers, and he owned another building where another brother and his family were. These weren't commercial properties, but that's really all I remember.

Glaser: Did your family as a group do things together?

Swig: Constantly. Constantly.

Glaser: Tell me about it.

Swig: Well, we always moved almost like a tribe, [laughter] because on both sides there were a number of siblings, and they were close. Each one of them had two, three, for the most part three children. Whenever there was the occasion, we were always together. Sundays we went for a picnic, all together. Family picnics, in fact, were very important gathering events. In Chicago, there are some beautiful parks, and we used to go en masse to Jackson Park. The Rosenwald Museum is there (it has a different name now), and the planetarium is there. It's a very beautiful area. Invariably on Sundays we would go out to the park, and every family would bring their particular goodies, and it would just grow like this.

It was wonderful because it gave us a chance to see our cousins. But it was very consuming, and I've thought about that a lot. In fact, I've even spoken to that issue, of the fact that it didn't leave a lot of room for new friends. I remember as a child, not that I disliked my cousins, because I liked them, they were just sort of part of my life, but it was very difficult to integrate a friend into that environment. That's what I do remember, as I grew up and as I became a little more socially conscious. I don't remember my parents really encouraging making new friends, because we had so many cousins to enjoy.

Glaser: It's quite different from today, where everybody disperses and spreads out.

Swig: Yes. Although my family carries on that tradition and are always arranging events to come together (however we always include friends as well).

Glaser: Did you travel on vacations?

Swig: As a family? Yes we did. We used to go down to a resort area. Chicago of course is on Lake Michigan, part of the Great Lakes. We would go to a beach resort, I think it was called Michigan Shores or Michiana. We would rent a house for the summer, and that was fun! Sand dunes, picking blueberries, and visiting other families. There was always another member of the family that would also rent a house, so we would have two or three houses to visit. So it was the same thing, it just sort of reinforced what was happening at home. But if we traveled, we did travel alone, just the five of us. My father liked to drive, so we would get in the car and drive. [laughs] I had a very pleasant childhood doing predictable activities and with no physical problems, no health problems and better than average success in school.

Schooling

Glaser: Tell me about your schooling.

Swig: Grammar school, high school, and college, but I didn't finish college, I got married after my second year.

Glaser: What schools did you go to in Chicago?

Swig: Shakespeare was an elementary school, and Hyde Park was a high school, and then I finished my high school in Los Angeles at Fairfax High School. We moved as a family in 1946.

Glaser: What caused the move?

Swig: My father wasn't a well man. He had a chronic health problem. He had one of these colitis stomachs. I remember when growing up that my parents would go to Florida in the winter. My older sister and I never went, but my younger sister, who was not well, would go (she was a very weak baby). They would take her to be away from the Chicago cold. They went down to Florida every winter, and I can't tell you for how long. My parents had a very

good maid, Mary, and she was like a surrogate parent. I think they would stay down there at least a month, or six weeks.

There was, I think, a need for my father to have warmer weather, plus the fact that one of his brothers had moved to Los Angeles. He also had a couple of brothers who instead of coming to Chicago originally had gone to live in Mexico.

Glaser: How interesting.

Move to Los Angeles

Swig: My uncle David and Aunt Annette lived in Monterrey, Mexico. I remember visiting them there a couple of times. They eventually moved to Los Angeles. One of the brothers was married to my mother's sister, so our move was a natural for my mother as well. Going to Los Angeles had a family attachment, plus it gave my father warmer weather. We moved in 1946.

Glaser: You picked up and moved. Was this after the war years?

Swig: This was after the war, yes.

Glaser: Where did you move to in Los Angeles?

Swig: I guess it would be called North Hollywood. My sister now lives in my parents' house, off of Beverly Boulevard on Alta Vista Boulevard. It's about three blocks from La Brea.

College Years

Glaser: So you started college--

Swig: At UCLA.

Glaser: And then you transferred to--?

Swig: To Berkeley.

Glaser: What caused that change?

Swig: Oh, I had to get away. [laughter] I had to get away.

Glaser: Were you the family rebel?

Swig: Well, I guess I might have been. My older sister was at UCLA also. I told my mother that not living away and having to come back every day felt like I was going to high school, and that I really had to test my wings. Either I felt it or they didn't suggest it, but I knew that there wasn't really an opportunity for me to go too far away. I mean, the state system was in place. My argument was it wasn't going to cost them that much more money, but it did give me a chance to be independent, and I had to have that.

Glaser: Was the family prosperous enough that you didn't have to work while you were going to school?

Swig: Oh, yes. Yes, I never had that situation, but I know my father was not real excited about our going to college. He wasn't there saying, "Now, you're getting to a certain point in high school and I want you to think about this and this." So following along there never would have been that encouragement to look into colleges. I don't remember even having a counseling system in high school. I don't remember any of that. Of course, the last two years of high school were not the best years for me, because I had moved away from my friends in Chicago.

And my sister had preceded me. She started at the University of Illinois, and then she transferred out to UCLA. UCLA was a fine school, and we were very happy; we were very grateful that we could go to college.

Glaser: Did you know early on that art was going to be your field?

Swig: No.

Glaser: What did you intend to be your major?

Swig: I don't know. I had English, and I had psychology, and I had political science. I was very oriented to political science, I liked that. I think if I had finished college it would have been as a political science major, with psychology the minor. I think that's what I would have done, because I ran for office, and I did other things like that. I liked the organizational things. And art was there, I enjoyed art. It has fascinated both my sister and me that we both wound up in an art field. She has a fine art gallery in Los Angeles, under her name, Tobey C. Moss Gallery.

I can assure you the two of us sort of look at each other and say, "Oh, my gosh, if our parents could see us now."

[laughter] It's really very funny, how we found ourselves independent of each other in that kind of a track. And of course, she even more so, because the gallery is a very heavy duty. I had a fine art consulting company, which doesn't have the inventory of a gallery, so I would say that she made an even more major investment.

Glaser: Tell me about your time in Berkeley. Where did you live when you came up?

Swig: I was in the AEPsi sorority, and I lived at the house.

[tape interruption]

Glaser: Did you have favorite professors at Berkeley?

Swig: I did. In fact, I have a very sweet story. I had a wonderful professor (it's interesting that you mention this) by the name of Dr. Jayne, Professor Jayne. He was an English professor. Everybody was in love with Dr. Jayne. It wasn't my exclusive love; everybody was in love with him. He was an attractive man, very articulate, sweet, not lofty. I always remember Dr. Jayne. I don't think I remember my other professors, but I remember Dr. Jayne.

One of my daughters, Marjorie, went to Brown, and her last year at Brown I was asking her about graduation, and so on. She said, "Well, Professor so-and-so is going to give me my degree." She graduated in "semiotics", a name which was coined at Brown and a major that was part of the English department. She said, "But Dr. Jayne is going to be there to present it." And I said, "Dr. Jayne?" She said, "Yes, he was my English teacher." I said, "Marjorie, you're not going to believe this, but when I was at Berkeley, an English professor, Dr. Jayne, was my idol." She said, "It's probably not the same one, but this man is absolutely wonderful too, we all love him." Well, I went to graduation and Dr. Jayne was the same professor. [laughs]

Glaser: Very interesting.

Swig: So at least he was consistent from generation to generation.

Glaser: Lovable as well. Tell me about meeting Richard. Or should I say Dick?

Swig: He probably would like Dick. He said I only call him Richard when I'm annoyed with him. [laughter] That's not true.

I met him on a blind date. I had transferred up to Berkeley, and a sorority sister by the name of Beth Edelstein--she's now married to Sandor Burstein--took a liking to me and one of my sorority sisters who transferred up with me. Beth wanted to fix us up, so she fixed me up with Morty Bakar, Gerson Bakar's cousin (I didn't know Gerson), and fixed my friend up with Dick.

Then at the last minute, like the night before or the day of, Morty decided he didn't want to take out a blind date, and my sorority sister decided she really was pinned to somebody in Los Angeles and that would be disloyal. So she didn't want to go out on a blind date. I guess Beth was in touch with the two fellows, and Dick decided he would still take whoever was left, and that's how we met. That's exactly how we met.

When Dick came to pick me up for our second date, he could not remember my last name. Fortunately for him, I was running for class office and had a banner strung across the sorority house porch with my name in bold letters for him and others to remember. He was lucky!

II MARRIAGE TO RICHARD SWIG, FEBRUARY, 1950

Responsibilities as Wife, Mother, and Hostess

Swig: We met in April, 1949 and we were engaged in August, and we were married on February 5. I insisted that I finish at least my two years of college. I felt very ambivalent about not finishing college. I've always felt a sadness about that to this day.

Glaser: Did you ever consider going on while married? I mean immediately after marriage?

Swig: I did. I think I wasn't strong enough as an individual to say, "This is equally important to me as this new marriage." I thought it, I knew it, all of the above, but I couldn't be that forceful. And I was very busy. Dick was actively working in his business, and we were busy as a couple. I guess I was like a hostess, helping him. So it would have been a direct conflict with what his plans were and what his needs were.

Glaser: What year did you marry?

Swig: 1950. So I flirted with it for years. Today I could do it, but I couldn't do it then. I just wasn't strong enough. And once again, there wasn't that support system from--I guess the most important would have been my in-laws, because my parents lived in Los Angeles. There wasn't that urgency, "It's very important for you to do this, you must do this." And so it would have been a real challenge, as I say, to Richard's husband-authority.

Glaser: Well, you're speaking of the times, really, as much as your own personality.

Swig: Yes, absolutely. But I did insist on finishing the two years so I could get an A.A. degree, so that's what I did.

Glaser: And then you had four children, so you had a very busy life.

Swig: Yes. I really had five. One of them did not make it through the whole pregnancy, but anyhow, we had four.

Glaser: Tell me about the children.

Swig: Well, I have a son who's going to be forty-four this month.

Glaser: And his name?

Swig: Rick. And I have a daughter who's forty-one, a daughter who is thirty-nine--

Glaser: The daughter who is forty-one, her name?

Swig: Susan. And then Marjorie, who is thirty-nine, and Carol, who is thirty-seven.

Glaser: So you had them all together.

Swig: Well, Susan and Rick are three years apart because it was in the middle of that when I had a miscarriage. Otherwise, they were two-two.

Glaser: That was a busy household.

Swig: It was, but it was wonderful. I enjoyed having children. I enjoy the family, I really do. I understand the value of family.

III EARLY COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Mount Zion Hospital, Good Will Industries

Glaser: You started becoming active when the children were still quite young.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: How did that evolve? I assume the Women's Division was your first activity, or was there something before that?

Swig: The Jewish community, yes, although Mount Zion might have been the first, I'm not sure. I was active at Mount Zion as a soda jerk. We used to work in the cafeteria. I loved that. I spent a lot of time there as a volunteer, really only in the cafeteria.

Glaser: Did you know Sylvia Stone?

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: At one time, she headed the auxiliary.

Swig: Yes. I loved her. She lived down the block from us in Seacliff. We were good friends. In many ways, she was like a mentor. She didn't know it, but just her way was so wonderful. I was really lucky, because she lived down the block, and then her husband died but she stayed down the block. When she married Daniel Stone, they moved up the block and across the way from us. She was really a wonderful person to have close by.

Glaser: I didn't realize that Mount Zion was one of your activities.

Swig: Well, it was. I spent a lot of time there but only in that capacity. I didn't get into the organizational part of it. I wasn't the head of this or the head of that.

Children's Schools

Glaser: Did you do anything with the children's schools, PTA and that sort of thing?

Swig: Oh, yes. I ended up being president of Town School mother's club at the time. I was very active in both the children's schools. The girls went to Hamlin's. Susan went to Burke's. I wasn't as active at Burke's as I was at Hamlin's. And then Carol went to Sacred Heart, and I wasn't active there.

Glaser: Why did you choose Sacred Heart?

Swig: She was having trouble at Burke's. She had gone from Hamlin's to Burke's just for a short time, and she didn't do well there. So we placed her into Sacred Heart and she did well. She graduated from there. This was when she was a high school student. However, by that time they had established a philosophy course as an alternative to the religious studies. (We did not want our child to have to take a religious course in Catholicism.) Also by that time, they had already begun hiring lay teachers.

I don't know whether you were aware of that, but at Sacred Heart all the teachers were nuns. I guess, like ourselves, others found that this school could be an alternative, and I think that Sacred Heart was wise enough to know that if they wanted to open up their school to the general community, that the faculty had to be opened up too. Carol liked Sacred Heart very much. I think she was there for two years. They had a very good faculty. We were not unhappy at all.

Glaser: But as a school was it more rigid, more organized than the other schools?

Swig: Not any more than the others, no. However, Dick and I felt it was more nurturing.

IV WOMEN'S DIVISION

A Comfortable Place

Glaser: Then you started in with the Women's Division?

Swig: I know I worked at Goodwill for a little bit, and then I started in with the Women's Division. I think it was in the early sixties, or whether it was the end of the fifties, I just don't remember.

Glaser: In my chronology, 1962 is the earliest that I came across your name in the minutes.

Swig: I think that's right. I would have been surprised if it would have been earlier.

Glaser: You obviously found it a very comfortable place, because you became very active in it.

Swig: Yes, I enjoyed it, I enjoyed it a lot. I enjoyed it for a couple of reasons. First of all, I know my mother-in-law and father-in-law were very active in the community, so it was a comfortable place to be for them. They didn't encourage me or push me at all to do anything, but it was the sort of environment in which I knew they were interested. By that time, my mother had died--my mother had died in 1951, when my first child, Rick, was three months. So it was really important for me to do something that also gave them pleasure. And where they were involved in the community, I felt that it was important for me to be involved with the community.

And it was natural, it wasn't unnatural. When I was at college, our sorority had Shriner's Hospital as their project. I spent a lot of time at Shriner's Hospital because of my AEPsi affiliation. So getting involved was all natural.

Glaser: Was this a way for you to meet other young women, or had that already happened?

Swig: I had already met a lot of people. So yes, on one hand the Women's Division certainly expanded my acquaintances and different acquaintances.

##

Swig: I think Franny [Green] probably was the only one from the initial group of people I met who really became involved in the Federation. The initial group I met were more friends of Dick's, and they never got heavily involved in the Jewish community, however Franny did.

So yes, the Women's Division certainly gave me another avenue of relationships, and I really enjoyed it. I always have felt very comfortable with my Jewishness, and my mother had been involved. She was a very organizational person as well. Within our family, she was really sort of the hub of our extended family. She was really quite a remarkable woman. So I felt very comfortable, having had this experience in my upbringing.

I liked what the Women's Division was doing. I liked the idea that the Women's Division was setting out on its own and could develop its own path, and that I could be part of it. And then I learned a lot, and where I had not completed college, it sort of vented that need to learn.

Educational Programs

Glaser: What were you learning?

Swig: Well, I learned organizational strategy, I learned the background of the Jewish community, I learned priorities. I learned values that reinforced those that had been part of my life and that I found were very important, period. I learned about differences of opinion and that not all members of the Jewish community were committed or interested. It was fun, it was fun and inspiring.

Glaser: Did this give you an opportunity to learn about the different agencies?

Swig: Yes, there was certainly orientation. That's an interesting question. I sort of jumped into the activities, with the Women's Division. It was all going to be good, and so it wasn't a matter

of differentiating whether I liked this or this or this. There weren't that many agencies at the time. There were really not many at all. So the Women's Division was all-encompassing, because it was trying to establish itself and it was trying to educate itself. We did have various programs where we could visit the agencies, or we could have people come and talk to us.

Glaser: One of the things I came across, and I think that you were the one who started it as the education director, was the "Come-See" tours. I assume that was to visit the agencies.

Swig: Yes. That was to encourage other women to get involved, exactly. There were "Come-See" tours, Thirteen Thursdays, and--

Glaser: What is Thirteen Thursdays?

Swig: Thirteen Thursdays was also a project. It was either visiting a site or listening to someone speak. It was purely all educational. It was a way of offering women something in addition to asking them for money, and I think the Women's Division felt very strongly about that. And that's what they brought to the table early on, to the general Federation that was very male-oriented. That it was important for people to have an image of a Federation that was just not signing the card, but the individuals were important for other reasons.

And I must say that would be to this day. It's a problem. It constantly has to be reinforced, and it's got to be prioritized as having real value because it doesn't have a cash figure attached to it. I feel as strongly about it today as I did then, and now we call it community development.

Fundraising

Glaser: Aside from this educational aspect, were you comfortable with the fundraising?

Swig: I think so, because I believed in the organization. That was one of the things I learned, that if you believe in what you're asking for then it's easier to ask. I learned that, and I learned not to personalize it, which of course is very hard. If you fail, or if you don't get the person to respond, that you feel sort of sorry for them. [laughs] But you don't feel as if you've failed. That was a very hard thing to learn, I remember.

Glaser: When you became the campaign chairman, did you--

Swig: For the Women's Division?

Glaser: Yes. Did you organize the campaign in a different way than it had been?

Swig: You know, I really don't remember, however I am sure that group dynamics was part of the orientation to work as a community volunteer. Usually when I am involved in something in a leadership position, I immerse myself in it and I try to be as creative as possible. So I would hope that I was as creative as possible. There was a lot of energy in the Women's Division, so I'm sure that we tried to do as many interesting things as possible. But I can't really be that specific. I could if I saw some minutes or something to trigger a thought. But there was so much going on. I was campaign chairman, and there was a lot of creative thinking going on. I drew from a lot of people and we worked together. I think we did a good job, and we had a good time.

President, 1970-1972

Glaser: When you were president, was this also true, this feeling of energy that you could call upon?

Swig: Yes. I don't like the idea of isolating myself at the head of anything. I really enjoy the opportunity of getting people in and brainstorming and then moving out, moving to lead and getting people to come with you.

Glaser: That must have been so satisfying. You talked earlier about when you were newly married, that it wasn't the time to assert yourself, and here you were in a position of leadership. It must have been really gratifying.

Swig: Well, it was. It gave me a lot of confidence in myself. The fact that I could make a thoughtful statement. By that time I had learned we could learn a lot and do a lot. We were in the Women's Division because we were growing, and we left open windows of opportunity. These are words that are not only good then but now.

Group Dynamics Program

Swig: I remember that we were one of the first communities to benefit from a woman by the name of Bea Finkelstein, who is unfortunately no longer alive, but who had initiated a program of group dynamics in the Women's Division, because the women were more receptive than the men to motivational tools.

Within the group dynamics program, you had a chance to think about why you do what you do, and how, and to really confront yourself as to your motives for what you're doing. And believe me, it was a very emotional experience for a lot of us. But you did learn about yourself. It was the closest thing to an encounter group that one could get. We really had a hot seat.

Franny went through it and Annette Dobbs went through it. There was an extensive group of us that went through it, and we came out all the stronger for it. So using those opportunities, it did give me confidence. It was very confidence-building. Without being arrogant, hopefully, you really could think about why you're doing something or how you feel about it. Why you're making that decision and why you're encouraging somebody else.

Glaser: Were you comfortable with public speaking?

Swig: Yes. I've always been comfortable with public speaking.

Federation's View of Women's Division

Glaser: I wanted to ask you, how did you perceive the Federation's attitude toward the Women's Division?

Swig: Very patronizing. Very patronizing and slightly threatened, because Women's Division presented new ideas that the existing structure did not. They didn't have that in their scope. They were just much more structured. They didn't have that flair that women, I think, were bringing to it. The women wanted to come in and enjoy it. They wanted to be creative doing it and offer something that was interesting and that was respectful, and so on.

The men in the main Federation--it was primarily men--were much more rigid, let's say. They wanted to get right to the bottom line. So they weren't comfortable with these nuances. They just didn't know what we were going to be doing. And when

we did present an idea like group dynamics, [laughs] they just didn't want any part of it.

Glaser: Men are a little uncomfortable with anything that's psychological anyway, aren't they?

Swig: Right, and that sort of stayed there. That's always been there, and I'll go back to the whole idea of that and education. That and something that didn't have a dollar sign to it, that cost money but didn't bring money immediately, was something that caused concern. They, the men, didn't want anything that would detract from what their mission was, which was to have people contribute money. So they didn't see that type of innovation as being beneficial. They thought that it could be done another way, i.e., peer pressure.

Glaser: Did the Women's Division do a better job of bringing in newcomers into the organization than the Federation itself did?

Swig: I know we tried. I wouldn't exactly call it a Welcome Wagon, but I know we started something like that. Whether or not we were so successful and that we moved the general community ahead, I don't know that we could claim that exclusively in that area.

A Change in National Structure

Glaser: In 1969, the National Women's Division was formalized and decentralized into seven divisions. And then in 1970, it was formed into state structures. What difference did this make to the San Francisco Women's Division?

Swig: Probably from the point of view of support, papers, conferences; maybe that's when Bea Finkelstein came out. She might have come out in the seventies, I'm not sure.

Glaser: So then you would have a feeling of being attached to something that was greater than yourself.

Swig: Yes. And it reinforced your validity, and you could begin to network with other women, which was very nice. They had speakers' bureaus and national workshops and conferences.

V ENTRY INTO FEDERATION

Budget Committee

Glaser: Then in the seventies you became part of the Federation by being a member of the budget committee. Did you choose the budget committee, or were you asked to be on it? Is this something that you wanted to do?

Swig: I don't remember, but it would have been something I would have been interested in. In fact, I think I remember myself defending the allotment to the Women's Division, and/or seeing more clearly how the money was being allocated, period. So it would have been something I would have been interested in, but I don't remember whether I was invited or whether I asked.

Glaser: I didn't realize that the Federation gave an allotment to the Women's Division. I thought the Women's Division raised funds that went to the Federation.

Swig: But I think for staff, they had to have an allocation. Originally the Women's Division did not have someone singularly dedicated to it, i.e., director, campaign director, and public relations.

Glaser: I see. So that didn't come out of the money you raised?

Swig: I believe there was an operating budget that included staff support. That's a good question; I'm afraid I can't answer that. We should have received monies from the Federation, certainly initially to get it started.

Glaser: From the budget committee, where did you go in the Federation itself?

Swig: I think I just stayed on the board of directors, went on missions, participated at national assemblies, served on other committees.

Chairman, Jewish Vocational Service

Glaser: Then you became a board member of the Jewish Vocational Service in 1973?

Swig: When it started.

Glaser: And how did that come about?

Swig: Well, there was an obvious need in the community to assist Jewish people and also recent college grads who did not have jobs, and I was part of the initial group that started the Jewish Vocational Service Agency. I was just interested in that area and it was amazing, it was really amazing how quickly it took off.

Glaser: In what way?

Swig: Since the agency opened up its doors, the doors have never closed. It was just amazing that the organized Jewish community sensed this need, did something about it, and it was the right thing to do. And the JVSA always did its work well, always; the people that were staff, the director, everyone. The JVSA was really lucky that they had good people beginning with Larry Lucks as director and today with Abby Snay as director. Her dedication and that of the staff and volunteers has always been outstanding.

Glaser: And you became the chairman of it.

Swig: Eventually, yes.

Glaser: How long were you the chairman? I don't have a date for that.

Swig: I don't know. It was either one or two years, I forget what the term was. I'm trying to think of who the first chair was, I believe it was Irving Rabin.¹

¹Mrs. Swig's term as chairman was 1978-1980. Irving Rabin was the agency's first chairman, 1973-1976.

VI FEDERATION TRANSITIONS

Louis Weintraub Replaced by Brian Lurie

Glaser: Would you talk about the change in executive directors when Brian Lurie was hired at the time when Lou Weintraub was the executive?

Swig: Yes. Lou Weintraub was the director and then who was the other?

Glaser: Sanford Treguboff.

Swig: Sanford Treguboff. I think Sanford Treguboff was there first and then Lou, or vice versa?

Glaser: No, you're right. Treguboff was the real old-timer.

Swig: Yes. They were very entrenched, very entrenched. And Lou Weintraub, very nice man, provided stability; however I did not feel he brought anything new to the table as far as a fresh approach. Brian brought a fresh approach. That was really a breakthrough, dramatically, for the Federation. Just his particular style, which has always been visionary and risk-taking. He just brought that kind of personality to the Federation.

It was a time when the Women's Division could feel that they had an opportunity to do something interesting, and I think all the agencies felt that it was a fresh breath of air.

Glaser: Both Treguboff and Weintraub were social workers. I think at that time the feeling was that the executive should have a social work training background. It must have been an unusual thing to have a rabbi as the executive director.

Swig: You're right. I think it was wonderful for a lot of people who could benefit from that type of emotional input that Brian put forth when he spoke or wanted to get a point across. He

biblical context, integrity, his views for involvement, and enthusiasm for extra measure to the position that you might not normally get. That he was steeped in the Bible, that he had something, in addition to a social work viewpoint, that could benefit and enrich your soul. And he loved to do that.

Many of the people that I worked with enjoyed it very much. He made you feel it was more than just work. With the other two gentlemen, who were very professional and very good, there wasn't that same dynamic there. They just had their own way of doing business. But Brian, by his training, just brought that other dimension which many, many people were looking for.

Glaser: Brian told me you learned he was teaching Warren Hellman about Judaism, and you had become so turned on when you went on a mission to Poland that you came back and wanted that too, and you were the impetus of bringing CLAL to conduct classes here.

Swig: I hope so, however it wasn't me alone. There were more than a few people who were interested as well. But it just reinforced the importance of learning. This goes way back to the whole opportunity for education as part of this whole process. So these were just little symptoms. They were just bits of evidence that we could bring something more into what we were doing. And yes, I thought Yitz Greenberg [Rabbi Irving Greenberg] was brilliant, was fabulous.

Call for Changes in Management of Jewish Agency and United Jewish Appeal

Glaser: To what degree were you involved when Brian took on the Jewish Agency in 1984?

Swig: Well, I agreed with him. I just agreed with the fact that something was not right and something should be done about it. That San Francisco, as always a thinking community, should be prepared to step out and make a statement, that we could raise awareness nationally and if we didn't, then I thought it would really do a disservice to our community. If nationally people didn't agree with our community, that was just unfortunate for them, because I think our argument or our discussion was not harmful, except that it was forcing an establishment to take a look at itself.

Glaser: One would think that that would come from a larger Federation, New York or Detroit, back east.

Swig: Well, but we were listed as a larger Federation. We were small but we were large because of our success in fundraising. So the results of fundraising that we were doing was equal to the larger communities. That's why we've always been lumped in the large community, we're always one of the large--

Glaser: The big sixteen, yes.

Swig: Yes. So we had something to back us up, and it was that we were raising big dollars, and we were monitoring the process. But even more than that, I think it was a respect for our own community. If we felt that there was something that wasn't right or could be done better, or people should be paying attention, or getting out of a mold, or reevaluating; if we felt that that was the way to go and we were not willing to do that, then I think that would have gone against the grain of our community, because our community has always been that way. We've always been willing to take a look and to help effect change, positive change.

Amuta

Glaser: Forming the Amuta 1986 was a big step forward.

Swig: A big step. Well, that didn't come first. The first thing was we decided that we were going to make an allocation of money. Forming the Amuta was a signal that we were actually seeking new programs that were relevant for the times and helpful to the people of Israel and seeking advice from Israelis (who were known community leaders/experts) on particular issues that we felt weren't being covered by the Jewish Agency. That was our argument. It wasn't that money was being misused, it was just that issues were not being addressed that were important to us, and that we wanted to do something about.

Federation Versus Jewish Agency

Glaser: You were part of the group that in 1984 met with those who came from back east to try to dissuade the Federation from its stand regarding the Jewish Agency.

Swig: I think I was, yes.

Glaser: Mr. Fisher from Detroit, and Chuck Hoffberger from Baltimore. Could you describe that meeting?

Swig: Well, they were polite. We were all polite. But I think we made our point.

Glaser: There were no threats made on their part?

Swig: I think they were annoyed and the threat was more that we could disturb or destroy something that was really a very strong entity, and just what were we trying to do?! So it was an annoyance, I think, more than a threat. They were angry. They were really annoyed with us.

Glaser: But then other cities followed you, didn't they?

Swig: Not immediately. Los Angeles, I think, several years later followed us.

Glaser: So you were out there in front.

Swig: And not being talked about in a kindly fashion. Yes, it was a warning in a way, it was a statement. At the beginning, I remember when we decided to allocate the money and how we cloaked it in a different way. We just had a couple of programs that we wanted to fund, and they weren't being funded by the Jewish Agency. It was important to our community and so on and so forth. It didn't mean that we were going to be disloyal, but at the same time we were saying why not take a look and see. If you cover these things, well fine, but if you don't, then we're covering them.

It was \$100,000 that we allocated, and they, meaning the hierarchy in New York, just panicked. [laughter] It was very telling.

Glaser: It's just as if the child is threatening to the parent.

Swig: Yes, absolutely, absolutely. It was really very telling.

Glaser: There must have been a good feeling when it all came out San Francisco's way.

Swig: I think we always felt good about it. We never felt that we were doing something so harmful, because we were still making our commitment overseas. It's just that we were doing something more. It was saying if the Jewish Agency wants to jump in and be part of this, then that's fine. If they want to expand or correct or review or refine or whatever, their allocations.

#

Swig: If they wanted to look into what they were funding, and if they wanted to include these areas that we were interested in, then that would be fine. Otherwise, it wasn't going to disallow us being able to do it, because it was important to our community to be involved in assisting in those areas that had to do with Arab-Israel relations that had to do with democratic principles, with education, with women's issues, and these were not being addressed.

Glaser: Would this challenge have come about if Brian was not the executive director?

Swig: I don't know. Perhaps not, however I don't know who the executive director would have been, whether he or she would have. But I do know that he encouraged that kind of thinking, and I think that it was right. I think it was very right. And he/it spawned a whole new vision of how we saw ourselves individually and collectively and in relationships to the Jewish Community overseas. Individuals, groups, institutions, the land, became more real, more personal, more visible, more "touchable."

VII FEDERATION ASSIGNMENTS

Campaign Chairman, 1985

Glaser: We haven't talked about your being the campaign chairman for the Federation. Did this go along with how you had run the campaign for the Women's Division? Was there a change in how you organized it?

Swig: I'm sure there was a change. It was done on the same basic strategy, however there had to have been a change. There was much more emphasis on one-on-one or getting closer to people, smaller events perhaps, really a lot more one-on-one. We made sure that volunteers on the campaign committee, as far as their cards were concerned, saw their prospects personally rather than just mailing their cards, things like that. We had more educational events, which at the time were largely in the Women's Division and were not being done in the same way in the general community. We had the telethon, the Super Sunday add giving levels/categories. Missions were becoming more and more important to campaigns.

I hope that there were more things that we did. There was better campaign material to explain what the Federation did and about the agencies. We did additional missions. There was the "roots" mission, and I think that that was sort of a beginning.

Glaser: What was the roots mission?

Swig: Well, we took a small group of people, twenty or so. We went to Eastern Europe, Poland, Czech, and Hungary, and then on to Israel. But the idea of going to Eastern Europe was just becoming more popular. The UJA had done a couple of missions like that on the small side, but for our Federation to do that just created another dimension--it gave you a background for what you would see in Israel.

It also gave you a background to your own history. This was particularly for people who were being asked to be campaign leaders but who really didn't have a lot of depth of memory of their own Jewish background. They were good fundraisers, or they were willing to make a substantial gift, but their guts were not involved. So this gave them a chance to get in touch with their personal history.

Glaser: Did you feel that with your background you had more of a Jewish feeling than many people in the Federation?

Swig: I had a more Jewish feeling than many people I was associating with within the Federation. I felt that my background was much more grounded in Jewish living, living Jewishly, than a lot of the people with whom I was associated. Meaning that I'd come from a more Conservative background. Most of the people that I was associating with were Reform. And though they certainly had strong commitment, the background wasn't there of participating in Jewish life and immigrant life.

Glaser: You had a number of committee assignments. You were on the executive committee, and the overseas committee, and Project Renewal. I'd love to have you talk about all of these.

Swig: They were wonderful. I loved being on the executive committee, because that's helping to shape policy and so on. I thought that was an important place for me to be.

Training for Leadership

Glaser: Did you feel that you were on the ladder and going upward?

Swig: To a degree. There wasn't that much of a ladder. The only ladder was that in order to be the president of the Federation you had to be a campaign chairman. That's the only existing ladder we had, even today.

Glaser: There's no feeling that this is someone to bring along?

Swig: If you served on every single possible committee and you were not a campaign chairman, then you would have difficulty in being a president of Federation.

Glaser: But nobody is brought along deliberately in terms of leadership training, if one is spotted as having that potential?

Swig: Oh, well, there would be encouragement. I think there's more of that going on today with leadership training programs, whether they're local or national, where people are hopefully being shaped for leadership. I don't think I saw that necessarily when I was going up. [laughter] There was an opportunity to take leadership positions, and certainly when you did take those obviously you were moving towards a certain goal. So people knew that you could be available or would accept or were interested or liked it or whatever. And maybe we made some attempts at that, but I don't remember a ladder.

Glaser: But the executive committee assignment was one that was very fulfilling for you.

Swig: The executive committee assignment comes with being the chairman of a committee. If you're the head of a committee, you're automatically on the executive committee.

Glaser: Oh, I didn't know that.

Swig: Yes. People who are serving on the executive committee, former presidents, if they would like, heads of committees, the campaign chair, the head of the endowment, those are the people who are taking titular positions.

Glaser: I see. I thought it was a smaller group.

Swig: No, no. However it is still not very big.

Project Renewal

Glaser: Tell me about Project Renewal.

Swig: Project Renewal was wonderful and an incredible idea that effected change both here in the U.S. and overseas. The success of Project Renewal was that it put us in touch with people in Israel rather than just the symbols, so it was really an outreach. It was a human outreach, a bridge. I think it dramatically changed the lives of a lot of the people in our community because of that. And it was a huge responsibility and commitment for a diaspora community financially and volunteer time and energy.

Certainly it changed the lives of the people who served on the Project Renewal committee or the overseas committee, changed it in a way that really helped them make the connections with

their emotions, their hearts, their contributions. They felt good about being able to go someplace and talk across the table or hug or shake hands, or meet the family of someone that was the recipient of their largesse or that we cared about.

I thought Project Renewal was wonderful, and I think it opened up and it brought forward the idea that if you want people to have an attachment to Israel, you've got to make it real. The emotion of the Second World War was receding, and for the next generation or generations to come there wouldn't be that same emotional reaction and awareness that there was something else that we had to do. This was a first step. This was the beginning, and that was touching, really reaching out and touching somebody.

Glaser: But Tel Hanaan, I understand, was a problem community.

Swig: It was a very tough community. It was a very tough community, very hard. However no one told us it was going to be an easy challenge.

Glaser: In what sense was it tough?

Swig: Well, the local leadership was very tough personality-wise. The community itself had really major problems, and did not have the attention of the government. It was not a glamour--glamour is not the right word. It was not a community that had a lot of charm. There were problems, real problems: logistic, economic, and social. And the leadership was dug in, not good leadership, inexperienced in diplomacy, very antagonistic, argumentative. I think that sort of compounded some of the problems. If the mayor involved would have been more charming, or he would have been smarter, or more engaging in his own style, then it would have been a different experience.

So I think we made the most of the experience, and I think we learned a lot, and we were very satisfied to be there. The Tel Hanaan leadership did not make it a pleasant experience. Kiryat Shmona became a very pleasant experience.

Glaser: What changes were you able to effect in Tel Hanaan?

Swig: Oh, I think we effected some very nice changes. I know that there was a lot of teaching the women how to do very basic chores. We implemented a learning center for Western ways: personal grooming, cleanliness, and how you keep a house, utensils, how you work a washing machine, how you set a table. It was very basic. We initiated something where women came together to talk and seek comfort from each other. We gave them

sort of a political position, grassroots organization on issues that were affecting them.

I think we did something about the transportation; the transportation system was terrible. The community was situated on a hill and all the shopping area was at the bottom of the hill. If you wanted to get back up, you had to walk. I mean, really steep walking. So just that. We helped to advocate for that. I don't know how much we changed it, but we advocated for it and for cleaning up their community. The Dobbses helped build a community center, which became the bane of Annette's existence.

Glaser: Why did it?

Swig: She wanted it used for a community center, and they ended up using it for a shul or a synagogue. It was not her original intent, and the political forces there made it really very unpleasant for her in that regard for a long time.

There was a playground that we put in, and we put just--we made changes there, but as I say, it was never received with that same kind of enthusiasm that another leader would have brought to it.

Glaser: And the overseas committee that you were on?

Swig: Well, the Project Renewal committee phased into the Overseas Committee. First there was the Project Renewal; then we had the Overseas Committee when we realized that we were really going to have the Amutah and a whole volunteer working structure. It became more than just Project Renewal. So it became the Overseas Committee, and within that was Project Renewal and one or two other projects.

Amuta

Glaser: Would you talk about the Amuta?

Swig: Well, that is Brian's doing. Brian started that, he did all the spade work for it. He had spent a lot of time in Israel. He had a real network there, and he had met some very, very good people. He felt that forming this Amuta, this volunteer board of directors to be our sounding board for program needs, could be wonderful for a lot of reasons. First of all, they could bring something to us that we weren't getting and that we were interested in. They would be faces, people with whom we could

establish a relationship rather than continue to go to Israel and just meet the bureaucrats and then come home and not have any emotional attachment. And that was wonderful.

Brian likes good people. He likes bright people, deep thinking people. The people he initially asked and who agreed to do this were some very, very interesting people--well educated, astute, interesting people. It was all brand-new to them too, and their willingness to do this, to take the time, was a real compliment to him and to our community.

Glaser: Did they oversee the disbursement of that \$100,000 grant?

Swig: Yes, not as much as they do now. At that time we kept all the controls, let's say. Everything had to be screened through us, it was a little bit tedious. But we were trying things out. And then as everybody gained confidence with each other, they began to speak out and say, "Listen, if you really want us to feel good about this, you've got to give us more authority, or you've got to respect the information that we're giving you." As that occurred, then we listened even more carefully to what they had to say and we agreed. So ultimately we allocated the money, but we listened very carefully to their recommendations and to the amount of money they were requesting, based upon how much we could allocate.

We really do listen--I mean, I hope that's the way it is today. But we listened very carefully, and they also gained a lot of confidence, too. So if they felt that we were ignoring what they had to say, and they felt that was not a positive thing, they let us know. We started having retreats with the Amuta, taking time while we were over there to have a retreat with them. They would come over here, or a representative would come over here. So it became very serious and institutionalized.

And going back to what you had said before, as far as communities following us, even to today there are not a lot of communities that have done this. It's a commitment, an investment of time, energy, people, and resources.

A Sense of Achievement

Glaser: Of the various committees that you served on before your presidency, what gave you the greatest satisfaction, the greatest sense of achievement?

Swig: I think the Project Renewal, the Overseas Committee, was one. And certainly Shalom '91.

Glaser: The Mega Mission?

Swig: The Mega Mission was wonderful, just wonderful. But I also enjoyed the community development effort that we made during my tenure as president.

Glaser: We'll talk about your presidency next time, but I wanted you to just address the committees.

Swig: I think the Project Renewal committee I enjoyed a lot. Going way back to Women's Division, whatever I did there with others on the shaping of the Women's Division and this whole idea of Group Dynamics, I enjoyed that tremendously. Getting individuals to really feel what they were doing, why they were doing it, I enjoyed that a lot. So I think probably those two things, and as I say, this whole going or moving forward, pushing forward the community development as a valid part of our structure.

I don't think I'm fearful of putting forward something for people to think about that is not necessarily in favor at the time or being thought about at the time. I feel the same way about women's issues. I've thrown out some little feelers about the Women's Division taking on the issue of domestic abuse, for instance, and have really encouraged them to take up that issue as a relevant part of what they're doing. The whole area of women's issues today in the contemporary world.

They have not picked it up in a way I think that they should. In a way that this Women's Conference that they want to have again--I think, perhaps, is going to. There was a Jewish Women's Conference a couple of years ago, and I think there's another one coming. The Women's Division is not the leader in that. There are other women's organizations that are organizing the program, and I feel very strongly that the Women's Division should be doing that, but they're not.

I think maybe there's either resistance within the ranks, because it does touch a lot of very delicate areas, or the general Federation is not willing to fund it because it would take additional money to do it. So it goes back to the sixties attitude again, where there's no apparent value added to that kind of education or community development. In the same way that culture was never a value for the Federation because it didn't produce a dollar.

Glaser: And yet, there is a National Jewish Cultural--

Swig: National Foundation of Jewish Culture.

Glaser: Right.

Swig: And it's only just within the last ten years or less that the Council of Jewish Federations sees it as a part of the umbrella.

Glaser: And yet that was formed a long time ago; I think back in the sixties.

Swig: I know the people who are head of it, now it's Richard Siegal, and it is still doing great things, great things. Did you happen to go to that event for Yehudi Kenar last night?

Glaser: No.

Swig: I didn't stay for the entire thing, but I stayed for a little bit of his speech, and he was giving a state of the union from his point of view. He immediately went to the issue of education in our community, and how we've got to do so much more educating if we're going to have a stronger community. And then he talked about accessibility and how we've got to allow people access at whatever points they can, rather than continue on the same structure. I'm paraphrasing this.

I left as he was speaking about it, but he took the situation of somebody he had seen who was not involved at all in the Federation or Jewish life, and then he saw him again at the Jewish Film Festival. For him, it was great, because he felt that this person felt comfortable going to that, even though he didn't feel comfortable going to the Federation or being involved there. Well, he went to the Jewish Film Festival, and perhaps this was where he could express his Jewish feeling and get involved, rather than in another situation where it might turn him off.

So what I think Yehudi was saying was that he was challenging the community to work very hard on developing those alternative possibilities for people who are not going to come along the traditional route.

Glaser: Well, Yehudi Kenar [?] has been one who has sought out Israeli artists and writers to come to this community.

Swig: I know, and the new consul general and his wife [Nimrod and Shlomit Barkan] are going to build on that because they're extremely interested in that. Mrs. Barkan did not have a position when she and her husband were posted to Washington, and she created a cultural position for herself and established a

terrific cultural program that took place in the Embassy. I started receiving mailings on it while I lived there, and some of my friends did also. I went to several of them, and they were terrific, and they were continuous.

Yehudi started something, and I think that the Barkans will build on it. I would be surprised if they don't. I mean I know that they will.

Glaser: That's great.

Swig: Yes, it really is.

VIII ISRAEL

[Interview 2: August 13, 1996] ##

Concern for the Future

Glaser: Before asking you about your own involvement in Israel, I wanted to get your feeling for the direction of the country following Itzhak Rabin's assassination and then the election of Benjamin Netanyahu.

Swig: Yes. Well, the direction of Israel?

Glaser: Yes.

Swig: My personal? [laughs]

Glaser: Yes.

Swig: Well, I have a great concern, great concern. I think the people of Israel do want peace, that the majority of the people there are interested in a peaceful solution. I think they're also very much aware of the fact that in their lifetime, and probably beyond, when you have such a diversity of culture in the way people deal with issues, peace will be as they see it. But I do think they would like to get on with their lives and see the economy continue to grow, and be able to see themselves in a sense of normalcy in the global scene.

As concerns Netanyahu, I have great concern about his leadership. Whether he will be able to temper, if you will, the Ultra Orthodox, which I think he married himself to with this election. The Ultra Orthodox is a minority group in Israel that is vociferous, maybe that's not the proper word, but they have been able to insinuate themselves in the political stream in a very effective way. They have a great deal of money and support from Ultra Orthodox Jews in other parts of the world who are just perpetuating and really strengthening their position.

Overseas Committee

Glaser: I want to ask you about the Overseas Committee. You mentioned it during our first interview, but I would like you to go into more detail. You were on the committee one year after it was founded in 1983. Would you go into details about its function and its scope and its mandate?

Swig: I think originally the overseas committee was started when it became apparent to our community that the allocations of money to the Jewish Agency, through the overseas arm of funding, were not going into new areas of our direct interest, and/or areas that we felt should be addressed, such as Arab-Israel relations, pluralism, democracy, some social issues. They weren't at that time being considered by the UJA [United Jewish Appeal] for allocations that were going to Israel. I think that our community, being very forward-thinking, felt that our community would want to look into those opportunities for helping programs to support these areas and to strengthen their mission.

So that was, I believe, the genesis of the Overseas Committee. We took funds out of our normal overseas allocation. It was a small amount; I think it was \$100,000, \$150,000, I can't even remember, however it became the shot heard 'round the world. The leadership of the UJA and the Jewish Agency really knee-jerked and thought that we were just doing a terrible thing.

Glaser: How was that money used?

Swig: It was used to support particular projects that had been brought to our attention that we felt were very relevant and that opened up windows of opportunity for peaceful coexistence for expanded education programs, women's issues, democracy, strengthen cultural diversity within Israel. And that's how it was initially used.

Project Renewal and the Jewish Agency

Glaser: Did this predate the Project Renewal?

Swig: I think Project Renewal was in the late seventies, wasn't it?

Glaser: I'll look that up.

Swig: Yes. That's a good question; I'm not sure.

Glaser: Ah, I have it here in my notes. Project Renewal was accepted in 1978. So you were right about it being earlier.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: But I was surprised that Project Renewal and not an ad-hoc committee was assigned the task of looking into the Jewish Agency, to study it and the Federation's relationship to it.

Swig: Because we didn't see it as concerning the allocation, you mean?

Glaser: No, I think it would be more than the allocations, but the total relationship.

Swig: Well, I don't think that kind of scrutiny or review came until even later. I think that the Project Renewal was a program developed by the Jewish Agency as a partnership, as an opportunity for communities in the diaspora to have a more hands-on relationship with Israelis. It was a vehicle to bring people closer, because early on it had been recognized that they needed to do something that would bring the diaspora community closer to Israel. The generational change showed that the people in the new generation were less interested in Israel. They didn't have that same emotional connection.

So this was a way, a very good way, I think, of connecting Jews in the diaspora to people in Israel and helping them in the community. We weren't scrutinizing the Jewish Agency. We might have been concerned, perhaps, at the time because it was known to be highly politicized. But we weren't scrutinizing.

However, in the eighties the question probably began, and rather than make a big deal of it, that we were criticizing or scrutinizing, we were more diplomatic. We were saying that we realize that the Jewish Agency did this, this, and this, and that our community would also like to do this. So we were taking these funds out in order to do that. Maybe we were sending up a little signal that the Jewish Agency should begin to look into some of their programs or some of the areas that they were not addressing, and make themselves a little bit more relevant and a little bit more accountable.

Glaser: There are those that think that the Jewish Agency is not relevant and should be done away with. Do you think that?

Swig: I have felt for a long time that there is certainly room for reevaluation and improvement, tremendous improvement. I mean, there's the whole issue of the World Zionist Organization and their power, and the Jewish Agency, and the cronyism that was

going on in the World Zionist Organization. There was a huge fight that took place ten, fifteen years ago to try to modernize and make relevant the structure and to get some of the people out of there that were in those positions for years only for political reasons, not because they were experts. There was a lot of waste of money, a lot of overlap and duplication and dead wood. That was going on at the time that I was most active in the Federation.

Partnership 2000

Glaser: What is Partnership 2000? It's a twinning program, but how does that differ from Project Renewal?

Swig: It's bigger. It's a broader vision. It's more regional than it is community.

Glaser: Is that totally within Israel? It has nothing to do with Jews living in the diaspora?

Swig: No. It's the next opportunity of connecting Jews to Israel. It's also a fundraising tool, really, where Project Renewal perhaps for some had run its course. Project Renewal did have a beginning and an end. You were supposed to be twinning with your community for X numbers of years, and at the end of that time the diaspora communities would step back. So it wasn't an ongoing financial relationship.

Glaser: Has it stopped for the San Francisco Federation?

Swig: I think the San Francisco Federation has gone into the Partnership 2000 now. Personally, I loved Project Renewal. I'm not crazy about the Partnership 2000 because it became, "Well, what's our next idea to keep this thing relevant, to keep things going so that we don't lose that constituency of Jews who were involved with Project Renewal when Project Renewal has run its course?" [telephone ringing] Because Project Renewal had to run its course.

San Francisco has maintained an exceptional relationship with Kiryat Shmona, and we've been very loyal, and I think we've benefited from that relationship. Just the idea that we established the Amuta has been an invaluable tool for an opportunity of our community to better understand the issues in Israel, or connect with issues that wouldn't normally be addressed by the Jewish Agency or by a broader agency.

Glaser: Is the Amuta, the committee of advisors, still advising the Federation?

Swig: Yes.

Diaspora Concerns

Glaser: And the issue of "Who Is a Jew", I think that was part of the overseas committee. Did you get involved with that?

Swig: Well, the issue of "Who Is a Jew" wasn't just the overseas committee. It was each Federation. It was the overall Jewish world.

Glaser: Did you go to Israel when the Law of Return was presented to the Knesset, to have that overturned?

Swig: No, I didn't go to that. I think I was at the General Assembly. The Jewish Agency meeting was in Israel at that time that year, where the discussion was taking place. But I didn't go with a delegation on the Law of Return.

Glaser: Do you think that that's going to be revived, since the Orthodox are so strong?

Swig: I do, absolutely. Absolutely.

Glaser: And with Netanyahu in power, there's more of a likelihood that it will be passed?

Swig: Just going back to my other statement, I think he's so married to the Ultra Orthodox that it would be difficult for him to step away from it. I don't think he has the political acumen to do that, frankly. And he's really quite beholden to them. So I do think it will be revived. They've been waiting for an opportunity for it to be revived. It wasn't going to be revived easily in the Labor party, but it will certainly be revived in the Likud party.

Operation Solomon and Operation Exodus

Glaser: What was the impact on the Federation of Operation Exodus and Operation Solomon?

Swig: I think it was very positive. It just was awesome. Operation Solomon and Operation Exodus¹ were in some ways two distinct procedures. Solomon was just a brilliant maneuver, and it still is amazing when you consider the complexity of the operation.

Glaser: That that many Ethiopians were able to get out?

Swig: Yes, and how they organized. I recently saw a video on it again because I serve on the JDC [Joint Distribution Committee] board, and they celebrated--what was it, the fifteenth year, maybe ten years? When was Operation Solomon? Was it ten years ago?

Glaser: I don't remember.

Swig: Well, whenever it was, they were celebrating the anniversary of it at the meeting that I attended in June, and they had an Ethiopian spokesperson who was one of the children that came out of Operation Solomon. They showed the video, and it showed how the leaders or young people, young men and women, went into the various villages to alert the villagers of what was going to happen, and how they wanted them to come and be at a certain place at a certain time, and the way they came. I mean, many of them, if not most of them, walked, walked.

Glaser: And long distances.

Swig: And long distances. And how they gathered and waited in Addis Ababa, waited for the time. I mean, the stoic nature of the people and just the patience of the people to have the confidence in their leaders, and then to wait. And then when the planes came, they just got on the planes and went.

Glaser: Can you imagine the impact of adjustment to modern Israel?

Swig: It's amazing, absolutely amazing. So that was it.

Operation Exodus was a major fundraising effort, commitment.

Glaser: Wasn't that also true for Operation Solomon?

Swig: I don't think it was in the same way. I mean, Solomon happened. Exodus was a commitment by world Jewry to raise these funds to make it happen because we had to pay for every one of those people to come out. It was a longer range, because it also

¹Operation Solomon was first mentioned in Federation board minutes in 1991. Operation Exodus, begun in 1989, was a fundraising campaign in support of Soviet Jewry resettlement in Israel.

included getting them settled, and that was remarkable. That, I think, really galvanized our community here. We did a great job. I think Brian [Lurie] was still the executive director, if I'm not mistaken, and we did a great job.

Glaser: Yes, I think people really responded to that.

Swig: Great job. Great job.

Glaser: If this had been done in the thirties, then perhaps the Holocaust wouldn't have happened. I think that was part of the whole feeling.

Swig: Yes. Of course, if everybody had known the same way we knew what was going on.

OTZMA

Glaser: Tell me about OTZMA.

Swig: I think I began by saying that I think it's probably one of the most outstanding programs for young adults in the world.

Glaser: These are college-age kids?

Swig: They're college-plus. I think you have to have at least one year of college. In fact, I think the young people that I met were primarily in their twenties--twenty, twenty-one. So it's not a teenager program. It's very intense, and I think that there's a lot of responsibility involved with it. But it's a beautiful program that I think right now is still not very well known.

Glaser: Is it nationwide?

Swig: Yes, now it's nationwide. I think it was initiated here in San Francisco. I think Brian initiated it [in 1986]. It was some way of attracting young Jewish people to Israel. I hope that one day one of my grandchildren will participate, because I think it's a wonderful opportunity of learning about yourself, and learning about your Jewish roots, and sharing something with the people of Israel. I think it's a life-changing experience.

It's different from the Peace Corps, I believe, in that you stay within the country but you move around the country. You don't stay in one location for the entire time of your visit. They leave you maybe two or three months, in some cases weeks, in

particular areas. So you definitely have a chance to mix with all different cultures within Israel and get a sense of their needs, and really to share whatever expertise you might have with them. I have met a lot of the OTZMA people, and I've never been disappointed. They're definitely people who will be sensitive leaders in their community. I use the word "sensitive," because I think that that's an important part of leadership. They're very sensitive people, and I think their experience in Israel makes them even more so.

Glaser: What kind of work do these young people do?

Swig: I think they really do whatever they're asked to do, some of them with daycare, some of them maybe doing physical labor. I'm not sure. Some of them might work in the schools; some of them during the summertime might be camp guides. They're imparting whatever information they have to the students, but at the same time they're learning from the communities that they're in what their needs are and how they can best help them. They're just a very intelligent, very committed group. I think it's a privilege.

Allocation of Funds--Local Needs Versus Israel

Glaser: For many years, Israel was a key motivation for giving to Federation, of responding to the various crises. Now Israel is no longer the poor cousin dependent upon the diaspora. Besides having impact on fundraising, Israel-diaspora relationships seem to be weakening. You've already mentioned that, and Teddy Kollek says so, as well as our Federation leaders on both west and east side of the Bay. Professor Jonathon Sarna of Brandeis University has said, "The challenge used to be maintaining a Jewish state. Now the challenge, which is no less important, is maintaining a Jewish life in the diaspora."

Do you feel that less of the Federation funds should be going to Israel now and more to the local agencies and local needs?

Swig: Before answering your question, I wanted to go back to the lessening of the relationship between Israel and the diaspora community. If anything, it's a product of our success in responding to the request that was made of Jews in the diaspora early on, to acknowledge the State of Israel and to acknowledge the responsibility of helping to build it. Encouraging it, and

fighting for its stability, and helping the people of Israel gain a comfort level with themselves and also with their neighbors and with the global community.

So I think the diaspora community has done a very, very good job, and perhaps what is being seen as a negative or a backing away is just a natural phenomenon. When you see something that is becoming more and more stable, you don't have to impose yourself constantly, or to the same level, as you did in the past.

As far as backing away completely, I think that that would be a big mistake because the country is still growing, the country still has needs. The country has been impacted by newcomers coming from different cultures, leaving their homes and their goods and their, perhaps, savings behind them. Coming to Israel because Israel has its doors open and is welcoming those Jews who would like to come. So long as that continues to happen, and so long as Israel still is in a state of having to defend itself (because I still think it's quite vulnerable), I don't think world Jewry should step back and say, "You're on your own," because I think that's a bad investment plan.

And also emotionally, I think Jews in the diaspora need that connection. There is the umbilical cord, and I think it's a good one. It's something that we should be happy that we have, and never take it for granted, and always be prepared to help it. I think it's important for us.

So having said that, as far as where our money should go, I think our money should still go to Israel. However, I think we should also be addressing the needs of our own communities, because we too have been impacted by Operation Exodus, by other mass immigrations, with Jews coming in to our community. Certainly San Francisco is one of the major recipients of newcomers from Russia. And even though we are a very sophisticated society with lots of opportunity, it doesn't necessarily mean that the people will be absorbed so quickly or be comfortable and hit the ground running. In some cases it will happen, if they have a particular talent or professional expertise, if they have a particular personality. But I would say probably with the majority it will take time.

Our community has been impacted, and I think we have got to acknowledge that. We can acknowledge it in two ways. Either our community is prepared to raise even more dollars to satisfy those additional needs; or if we're not prepared to do that, then we've got to accept the responsibility of stepping back from our longtime commitment to Israel because we don't have those

dollars. Now, we have a very affluent community, so one could say that we could continue to raise the dollars. We have a very good economy; we could continue to raise the dollars.

[telephone] So maybe our San Francisco community wouldn't necessarily have to step back from its responsibility with Israel and at the same time satisfy our needs here. But I can't say that that's going to happen across the nation.

Glaser: Of course, you've also been impacted by a loss of government funds and a loss of--I keep thinking of it as Community Chest, but that's not what it's called.

Swig: United Way.

Glaser: Right, the United Way funds.

Swig: Yes. Those are real losses, and they're getting even more real. That's going to happen more and more, and certainly we've been talking about this since before I was the president, and we'll be talking about it--

##

Swig: With the various reforms that are going to be put in place, our community is going to be struggling with how are we going to be able to satisfy both. Probably the overseas arm will suffer from that. It already has; I think we've reduced our overseas allocation quite a bit. I don't even know what it is now; it might be 40 percent. I don't know what we give. Even less than that maybe; maybe 35 percent goes overseas.

However, we can also make it up in another way. There seems to be an emphasis now on designated giving or funding for specific programs. It could very well be that in our community, and maybe throughout the country, that designated giving will help in areas where the general community has cut back.

Glaser: I thought that was something Federations opposed.

Swig: Well, not any more. Not any more. If anything, there seems to be a growing awareness of the fact that this is a real direction. The premise, I think, with designated giving is that you, the donor, by doing your designated giving, do not back away from your annual giving. If you're giving \$10,000, and you've been giving \$10,000 for several years, [telephone] and somebody asks you for an increase, if you say, "Well, I really would like my monies to go X, Y, Z," the leadership would encourage that as a designated gift but not at the sacrifice of your core gift. So you would stay with your core gift of \$10,000. If they're asking

for a 10 or 15 percent increase, that would go towards a particular program of your interest. That's the basis, that's the premise for accepting designated giving.

Glaser: My idea of it was altogether different.

Swig: What's that?

Glaser: You didn't give to Federation, you gave directly to either an agency or to Israel and bypassed the Federation.

Swig: Well, you know, you can do that, but you're destroying your infrastructure. You would be destroying [telephone] what has been built up in such an admirable and productive way for the last umpty-nine years.

Glaser: That was the whole concept of Federation.

Swig: That's the whole concept of federated giving. And federated giving works. You know, you may not be able to satisfy all the needs, because the needs grow so dramatically. Just what we're talking about right now. But you don't want to throw the baby out with the bath water, because you still have those services that are constant and must be provided.

If you have been a donor all these years, you can see the results of your contribution, because you have a healthy Federation structure. The needs may not be fully satisfied, but the Jewish Community Federation is healthy and is serving the people. If you want to help a specific agency--let's say the Jewish Family Service Agency, which is suddenly dramatically impacted by the arrival of Russian emigres and at the same time losing the government subsidy, well, that's just fine. But your core gift is going to a myriad of services that are helping your community on an ongoing basis and helping you directly or indirectly. So if you want to make a special gift, a designated gift, do that, but not at the sacrifice of your core gift. That's what federations are striving for. Otherwise, we'll lose our core, we'll lose our principal.

Underwriting Loan Guarantees

Glaser: In 1992, the Federation agreed, if necessary, it would help to underwrite the Council of Jewish Federations loan guarantee for settling the Russian emigres.

Swig: Right.

Glaser: Would you discuss that?

Swig: Well, it was a shared responsibility. That was the term for it, "shared responsibility." We agreed to an amount that was based on a particular formula for our community. It was a guarantee so that these loans could be made, and so on.

First of all, it was a very healthy decision. I don't think our money has ever been called. The loan guarantee program has been, I think, a great success. There was certainly built into the formula a percentage of loans that they felt would never be paid back, just like in any situation. But I believe it's been quite successful. In the last couple of years, I have not kept up with it. However, I think I remember reading in one of the minutes a vote was taken, or is being taken, that the amount of money we had guaranteed might be more than necessary. I'm not sure; we could find that out. Maybe there was a recommendation to reduce the amount of money that we've set aside. We've never been called over all these years, and we could use that money for exactly the same group that we've kept it for.

Glaser: Was there any difficulty in getting this agreed to?

Swig: The original agreement?

Glaser: Yes.

Swig: I don't recall that there was. There certainly was a lot of discussion, but it made a lot of sense. I mean, it all has to do with faith in what you're doing. You have to take that risk. If you're willing to bring people out, and you're raising funds to help do that, and you want to help them set up their business or get their lives together, then there's a consistency as far as the kind of continued commitment that you're willing to make, and this is part of it.

Mega Mission to Israel, 1991

Glaser: At our first meeting, you mentioned in passing the Mega Mission, which was so successful--

Swig: Yes, it was great.

Glaser: --that you and Dick [Swig] arranged. How did that all come about?

Swig: It came about because other communities had begun to do it. I believe Philadelphia or Pittsburgh did a Mega Mission.

Glaser: Philadelphia. We were in Jerusalem when the people were there from Philadelphia, a huge number of people.

Swig: Yes, huge number of people, huge success, very exciting, and the suggestion was made that other communities should try to do it. New York, I believe, tried to do it; I think down in Florida they were trying to do it. We thought that we'd like to try to do it too. [telephone] I believe Philadelphia had something like 800 people, I don't know. It was some huge amount. I think they had two 747's; I'm not sure. It was huge.

So we decided to try to do it. Dick and I chaired it, and then we developed the formula for what we felt would work for our community in trying to get the various constituencies interested in going. I mean, it was a large group; it could have been a very impersonal group, it could have been very chaotic. There were a lot of people who had been to Israel before, so how do you make it interesting for them?

Also, by that time the idea emerged that you would interject culture into a fundraising mission, or ultimately a fundraising mission, and see whether or not this was distracting. That thought was beginning to dissolve so that culture became important. It all had to do with the growth of the state, that this was something that should be shown, because this was part of the growth of the state, and it shouldn't be ignored or denied. So we had culture and politics and archaeology--well, you know that.

Glaser: Yes, we were on Naomi Lauder's politics bus.

Swig: [laughs] On the AIPAC bus.

Glaser: At the time we were in Jerusalem, when the Philadelphia Mega Mission was there, I happened to go down and have breakfast alone, and the waitress came over and thanked me for coming. I thought to myself, I've got to tell her I'm not part of it, but I didn't want to disabuse her. But it was obvious that it meant so much to Israelis.

Swig: Yes. I think probably one of the finest parts of those Mega Missions is that there was such an impact. And Israel was going through very difficult times during that time. Of course, we came in just after the Gulf War.

Glaser: That's right.

Swig: And that was even more traumatic. Let's see, we started working on this, I think, in September or October, and there were other Mega Missions being planned. Then the war began, and a lot of those Mega Missions canceled, which was very, very destructive, I thought. [tape interruption] So we ran into that decision-making: we had to decide whether or not we would hold to our Mega Mission, or whether we too would back away.

We made the decision that we would just get through the Gulf War [telephone]. We had our own strategy, that the war would not go on for a long time, and we should keep a very positive attitude. That it was very healthy for our community and very healthy for the Israelis, and if, as it moved along, our government and we felt that it was dangerous, then we would cancel. But we didn't want to just cancel prematurely.

Glaser: The amount of organization and work that went into that must have been just tremendous.

Swig: Well, it was tremendous, but it was fun, it was interesting. It was interesting. And it got people thinking about all the facets of Israel. We wanted to reach beyond the fundraising aspect and reach into the soul of Israel, to the people. We wanted to make sure that people met people. That one of the things that they would take back was contact with an individual rather than what could have been happening with a lot of the previous missions, where you listened to a lot of people but you never really made contact with them. For instance, the home hospitality was very important to us, or anything where we could bring Israelis and the community people together.

Family Involvement

Glaser: Would you discuss the Swig family's involvement in Israel? I know it's quite extensive.

Swig: I wish my father-in-law [Ben Swig] was here to say a few things, because he could really better tell that part of it. I think my father-in-law was involved with the State of Israel from its inception, and through his interest and involvement he shared that interest with the rest of our family. We all agreed that this was an important thing for us to be involved with.

Then as each one of us became involved with our Federation, or some Jewish organization, Israel was always part of that. Dick and I went to Israel first in the sixties, 1966 or 1964, just for a very brief time. We were there, I think, at Passover time, in fact. It was an interesting experience for us, and I think I've gone back almost every year since then. Then there was a period when I was going three times a year.

Certainly my brother-in-law Melvin went more than several times, and our children have all been to Israel at least once. I think a couple of them have been there a couple more times. They haven't had that same emotional tug that our generation has had, for whatever reason. I think other members of our family have involved themselves directly, and there is definitely an interest.

And then we involved ourselves with bricks and mortar, with capital projects--

Glaser: Bricks and mortar is a very polite way of talking about financial contributions, isn't it?

Swig: Well, there were both, for social programs and capital programs.

Glaser: I read in the Jewish Bulletin that you and your husband have given your family histories to be put into a time capsule in Israel. Can you tell me about that? Also, could we have a copy for this volume of your oral history?

Swig: Hmm. It wasn't so much an oral history as it was a family tree.

Glaser: Could we have a copy of that for your volume?¹

Swig: Yes, if we can find it. I hope I have a copy. This came through the Israel Bond organization. Our family has been involved with the State of Israel Bond organization probably since its inception. Ben and Dick and I, and I think Mel, all served at one particular time or another as chairman of the local Israel Bond organization, and I served as a national vice president for years.

Last April, they celebrated the families who had been so heavily involved with the organization and invited them to come to Israel with their families, or at least to send a representative, and to be part of this four- or five-day celebration, which included placing a family tree in a time

¹It was not possible to obtain a copy of the Swig family tree.

capsule. It was a statement that we didn't necessarily write, but the Israel Bond organization wrote, about the family's involvement. They placed it in a time capsule that was sealed in the gardens just behind the King David Hotel. There are some beautiful gardens. So that was that. It was a very nice ceremony.

IX THE FEDERATION AND THE COMMUNITY

[Interview 3: August 20, 1996] ##

Demographic Study Approved, 1985

Glaser: We've not discussed the demographic study that began during Larry Myers' presidency. It was expensive; it cost \$650,000. Do you think that it was worth it? I assume it was merited to find out how many Jewish people were living in the west Bay Area, but was it worth that cost?

Swig: Well, as compared to what? I don't know, \$650,000--was that the normal amount one has to pay for that kind of information? There's no real relationship for me, because I don't have another demographic study to compare it to.

But was it important? I think it was important to do a demographic study. And what came out of that should be something that creates a path for the years down the road. So I think for an organization like the Federation, which is very sensitive to its constituency and attempting to broaden it and to serve it, it behooves the Federation to do that kind of a study within a certain period of time.

Was it worth it? I mean, I wouldn't put it in a dollar sense, because whether it was \$250,000 or \$650,000, the benefit has to be what came out of it.

Glaser: And what came out of it?

Swig: What came out of it was, in some ways, shocking. First of all, what came out of it were the numbers of Jews that were living in the overall Bay Area, which was a goodly amount. I think it was something like 220,000 people that were around the area, maybe more. I don't have these numbers, but I think the numbers of gifts the Federation receives doesn't even come close to the numbers of Jews who are in the area. So what it meant was that

even though we were a successful Federation and could pat ourselves on the back for raising a great deal of money, there was an audience out there that we were not reaching and were not clamoring to get involved with us. So I think that was information that was very, very valuable.

Glaser: Were any steps taken to reach these people who were unaffiliated?

Swig: I think that's down the road. I think the first step was: now that you know this, what do you do about it and how do you do it? I'm trying to think, frankly, what a lot of the steps were. For instance, the Bulletin. Could the Bulletin play a broader role in that? How do the synagogues play a role--are they sensitive to that, and can they play a larger role? Is there a neighborhood policy that you can come up with. In other words, could we be more inclusive? We obviously weren't being inclusive enough, and we weren't marketing our product.

Now, I think those words, "marketing," started to come into the Federation's vocabulary--public relations and marketing. We had never really done public relations as other organizations might--the Red Cross, United Way, that type of thing. I think the Jewish community was very shy about being too open about itself, shy about going to the general press and taking out an ad, or doing anything that was more commercial. And I don't know where that stems from. It could stem from way, way, way back, when the Jewish community just didn't talk about itself, didn't want to raise any--

Glaser: Don't make waves.

Swig: Don't make waves, that's true. But those words started to come into our vocabulary: how do we position ourselves, how do we present ourselves. Do we tell our story in the proper way?

Strategic Planning Committee, 1988

Glaser: Were these things considered and acted upon by the strategic planning committee?

Swig: The strategic planning committee talked about all of these issues. The strategic planning committee was headed by Ron Wornick. He immersed himself as the chairman of that strategic planning committee, trying to ferret out all of these things, and trying to come up with items that could be acted upon. There were some wonderful people on that strategic planning committee. People that hadn't normally been involved in Federation

activities, who were experts in the area of marketing, of merchandising, public relations.

I'm sorry to say that enough did not come out of the strategic planning committee that was acted upon, much to the concern of Ron, who was really very discouraged. There was a lot of energy, a lot of talk, and not a lot of action, because it all took money and it was not immediately revenue-producing. The leadership at the time was very conservative, and so they were very bottom-line-oriented. They felt they had a responsibility to the community to raise money and allocate the money to the agencies they were serving. This kind of an effort, even though it was important, the idea that they'd have to hire additional staff--they'd have to make a department of it--they shied away from it. They shied away from it.

Glaser: Did the implementation committee pick up from the strategic planning committee and carry out some of its aims?

Swig: I'm sure that it did. Honestly, I don't have that material with me. There were some things that were implemented, but there weren't enough things that were implemented. Although it did start us on the path of heightening the awareness of the Federation. I'm trying to think of when Mike Welsh came on staff at the Federation as public relations or information person. I think he was probably one of the first "professionals" in that area, broader professionals than Federation ever had, that brought in a different perspective, a more sophisticated, more urban perspective that was not always focused on Jewish but could be addressed to the general community as well.

And so they started looking at the graphics of their brochures and how it could be more interesting to people, and how do they describe themselves. So from that point of view, I think they began to do new things at that time, and each year they've tried to improve that: How do they tell their story and make the material attractive so it's not so institutional that you're just going to toss it.

I don't know when Super Sunday started, but maybe they started Super Sunday at around that time as well. It may be a little bit older than that, but the idea of getting onto the telephones and doing telemarketing, that might have come out of that strategic planning.

Glaser: Many people feel it takes an awful lot of money, time, and energy to raise small amounts of money over the phone, rather than one person giving a great deal.

Swig: Right, right.

Glaser: But doesn't the feeling that you're involving more of the community make this worthwhile?

Swig: Well, what you're saying is right: it does take a lot of energy to raise a small amount of money, and this is a constant argument. Your major fundraisers will tell you, and we all know, that the small group gives the most amount. But if you want to be an inclusive organization and make people feel that they're welcome, then you're going to have to welcome them at all levels. If the whole idea is to give to your max, at your capability, then you've got to accept that fact.

The adage is that the people, even in San Francisco, really don't give to their max, that some of them give excellent gifts, but they don't give to their max. While some people who are giving small gifts probably give more of a max. So you've got to be sensitive to those smaller givers as well, because they are your people. They're the bread-and-butter, if you will, and if you want to be an inclusive organization, you've got to address that.

Also, what you're doing is you're growing them, you're nurturing them. In many cases, they might be a future major giver. You never know what will happen in their circumstances or what their offsprings will be, and so on. So from the point of view of really being a community, there has to be room for both.

Glaser: A number of task forces came out of this demographic study. Were you involved with any of them?

Swig: If I was involved, it probably would have been in community development or in financial resource development, probably financial resource development. I think that's the committee I sat on with the strategic planning committee.

Glaser: What did the committee come up with?

Swig: They talked about various ways that you could raise more dollars and how you could be innovative. The idea was that you should blue-sky it, to just think of any and all ideas that could possibly be of interest, that seemed fantastic, and just throw them out on the table because eventually one of them is going to be do-able. So rather than stay confined to very narrow, tried-and-true, or safe ideas, really just open up your mind to new and bigger ideas and just let it flow.

I like that idea. I think that's much more interesting for people, because you never know what will click. I think you have to keep yourself open to the possibility that there is something the wisest of them have not thought about. And also, when you do

that type of thinking, you interest other people, because it shows that you're willing to have some imagination and some sense of creativity rather than to just keep yourself narrow-focused.

X FEDERATION PRESIDENT, 1992-1994

President-Elect

Glaser: Before you became president, you were president-elect for six months. This was something new that was started in 1988. Was that helpful to you?

Swig: To a degree. To a degree. It gave me an opportunity to be in touch with Don Seiler, to ask him questions, and so on. I think it's certainly worth continuing. I don't know whether they're doing that today, but I think it's worthwhile, if the president-elect is willing to give the extra time. Sometimes the president-elect is leading something else--she's so busy that she's not able to make too much of a commitment of extra time. But it does help you to hit the ground running.

I think when you become the president there is something that's given over to you that allows you to feel you can really begin to exercise that kind of leadership. Otherwise, you're quite respectful to the previous president. On the other hand, the previous presidents, as they wind down, sometimes welcome the fact that they can move some of that responsibility or thinking over to the president-elect, so that they have a chance to formulate their thoughts ahead of time.

Staffing

Glaser: During that period, the Federation had to restructure itself financially and cut back a great deal. Were you part of that effort?

Swig: I think the entire board was part of it. We just had to make the decision to tighten up. I think it's something the Federation

should always do, however not at the sacrifice of programs. But if they feel they themselves are not running efficiently, then they have to take a look at the administration and their staff.

But Elly, you know, it's interesting. In reading over some of the papers, the idea of cutting back staff is not necessarily in the long run productive because two things happen. First of all, there's an overburden on the existing staff and it doesn't allow for additional programs. Second of all, it doesn't allow for additional thinking because you're so busy just with the programs and the day-to-day that you're having. Yes, you show a bottom line that is improved, but I'm not sure it improves the overall effort of the Federation.

Glaser: But there were those who thought that the Federation was overstaffed.

Swig: Yes, it might have been overstaffed because maybe they weren't generating programs to their potential. Maybe they didn't have the right people there at the time. If you have excellent staff and you give staff the opportunity of using their minds, and their ideas, and their expertise, and allow ideas to flow, then that "extra" staff can be really quite productive. If you have extra staff and the productivity level doesn't raise itself, then yes, you take a look and you say, "Well, how can we cut back here, because there seems to be a lot of duplication of effort."

A whole other story is the level of quality of staff at not only our Federation but other federations, and the pool of resources for positions, and how they choose senior staff. I think there's a major, major opportunity for improvement in that particular arena.

Glaser: In the past year or two there have been articles in the Bulletin about how communal workers feel about themselves in regard to the community. Many feel they're not really valued, not paid enough, not given enough respect.

Perceiving a Need for Changes

Swig: Well, I'll tell you, during the time that I was president we tried to address that. One of the things during my time that was important to me was getting the executive staff of the agencies together to meet on a monthly basis. I think it was either a monthly basis or every two months. We met for lunch, and at each lunch I asked one or possibly two agencies to make a report to the other heads of agencies. We met on a semi-social level, and

we listened to each other and then asked questions of the two presenters.

For exactly that reason: I wanted them to know that as a lay person and as head of the Federation it was important for me to hear from them, and I really respected what they had to say. Also that I thought it was important for the other agency heads to listen to their colleagues, because so many of them are so busy that they don't get a chance to do that. I know that happens--certainly it happens in government all the time. It was very important to me.

Glaser: How did you feel about being president of the Federation?

Swig: Oh, I liked it very much. I was very happy to be the president.

Glaser: What were your goals for yourself, and for the Federation?

Swig: To be more inclusive, to stress community development. To be more hands-on, more people-friendly, try to do things that would really show the human side of Federation rather than just asking people for money, though certainly the money was key, to try to get away from money as being, in the minds of many, the only reason that Federation talked to them. So community development was a very important issue for me.

Glaser: What did you do to increase that community development?

Swig: Well, I pushed for a substantial community development department; an area within the overall structure of the Federation that would be devoted to community development and wouldn't be just a part of the campaign. Up until then, the campaign had had a community development component, because of coffees or receptions they held concerning the needs of the campaign. But I wanted it to be separate and apart from the campaign so it had a nurturing aspect and a welcoming aspect. "We really care about you and in the long run you're going to learn about what the Federation's doing. But the first thing is we're not going to tell you you have to give money in order to have us be receptive to you."

Glaser: Can you be specific about what actions were taken by this department?

Swig: We decided on areas where we felt there could be improvement. One of the major areas was the relationship between the synagogues and the Federation. We felt if we could take steps to relieve what was a real tension between the Federation and the synagogues, if we did nothing else we would have done a lot. Dr. Susan Folkman, a board member, was very helpful on that. We

sent out notices to the rabbis and asked them to come together with their executives, their managers, or send a representative to a gathering to talk about this, that we wanted to listen to them and really try to respond to areas that have created tension.

Because there was this "we-they" mentality, where the Federation felt that the synagogues were not being open and available for potential members of the Federation. The synagogues felt that the Federation really wasn't at all sensitive to their needs or what they were trying to do, and the role that they played, and they were right. I think they were very right. I think in many ways, over a period of years, there was an arrogance that was growing within the Federation that didn't leave a lot of room. The synagogues were struggling, and we were not really helping.

Glaser: Was there the expectation that the synagogues would have a fund appeal for the Federation during High Holidays?

Swig: Well, there was suggestion of that. The Israel Bond Organization had traditionally had its bond sales during the High Holidays. Some synagogues accepted that and did it willingly, and others absolutely refused to do it. I don't think their reasons were valid; I never agreed with them. I felt that, you know, we're all in this together, and if we can help to get the message out, there shouldn't be any offense here.

But it was sort of symptomatic of the problem of why we as Jews resist an opportunity to get a message to our fellow Jews of how we can help, particularly when in the case of Israel Bonds it was an investment, and so on. So that was one thing.

I can't remember the first time that the Federation really wanted to have an appeal. I know that they wanted to have an appeal for the Russian emigres. They may have wanted to do something even earlier, I can't remember. But there was a tension, there was a tension.

So we reached out to the synagogues, and we got a wonderful response. We gathered the rabbis: Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and I think the gay-lesbian--the whole gamut.

Glaser: Were you part of these meetings?

Swig: Yes, it was my presidency. Yes, I was. I was absolutely. We told them what our thrust was and what we wanted to do. The whole idea of the community development. That we needed their help, and we wanted to be helpful to them. What was it they needed from us? Some of them said, "If you give us more money

for our Sunday schools," or whatever. But we said, "How can we work together and make this all work?"

Then we formed focus groups around our area: Marin, Peninsula, I think we had one up in Santa Rosa, San Francisco, and so on. Susan really ran those. They were quite successful, and very well attended, and substantive. They came out with issues that were brought back and then filtered, put together, of what some of the needs of the people were, what they felt was important.

It was a good feeling. You really felt as if you were going beyond the traditional, that you were breaking new ground. I think as a result of that we also altered the planning and allocations process, it was changed slightly. I'm trying to think of what else came out of it.

##

Swig: That stood out in my mind as breakthroughs in the traditional way of doing things at the Federation. I had hoped that they would institutionalize the community development department. That it would not be seen as a drain on our main purpose, which was to raise the dollars, and so on. That it would begin to have a parity with the campaign and be prioritized, be at the same level as the campaign. I thought in many ways it was as important, because what you were doing was you were really developing the future, and you were growing friends in the future.

The demographics showed that thousands of people were not ever even close to the Federation. Intermarriage was rampant in our community, and the young people growing up really couldn't care less. So how were you going to get those people to be interested in what you were doing? You had to provide an access for them that they were interested in.

You had to be sensitive and clever and creative about how you shaped your strategic plan or your plans for the future in order to take them in, to be available for them. Because they weren't going to be available under regular circumstances. There were too many alternatives, way too many alternatives, and most of those alternatives gave better perks than Federation did. Better acknowledgement for smaller dollars--I mean, all those things that kept coming to the fore.

If you know that, if you do a demographic study and if you do this kind of a fundraising study, and it keeps coming back to you again and again that this is what we're faced with, then either you don't have to do anything or you make dramatic changes based on what you're learning. And a dramatic change would have

been taking a community development idea and institutionalizing it, and making it so important that it was staffed properly, funded properly. The programs coming out of it or the energy coming out of it really were viewed as making a difference and could be effective.

But it took dollars, and it didn't show a bottom line, and so the return on your investment was not something that was going to be apparent for maybe five years.

Glaser: That makes it difficult.

Federation Endowment Fund

Swig: There has to be a real buy-in. Based on that, my next concern was how our endowment was being used or not being used. I had some real questions about that that I still have today. The mindset of the endowment in many ways is not as liberal as I would like to feel it could be, liberal from the point of view of how they view themselves.

Phyllis [Cook] has done a wonderful job, as has the lay leadership, in developing the endowment. It's stellar, absolutely stellar, as far as getting people to be interested. They've provided all kinds of unique and safe investment plans where people can place their dollars and still feel they have control over the giving. And that's wonderful.

But at the time I was the president and before (and I think maybe today it's the same) there was also a "we-they" mentality: we the Federation and they the endowment. Sometimes you had to beg for the endowment to be willing to fund a particular project that didn't have all the i's dotted and the t's crossed, or to think about funding a project that was long-range, really institutionalizing it rather than seeding it for two or three years.

Glaser: I think that that's the philosophy, really, seed money for projects.

Swig: Yes, and that's not a bad philosophy, but there's room for the other too. Although I felt it was important then too, but today for sure, I think it would not be imprudent for them to look at making very substantial commitments that would absolutely assure the existence of a particular project or program.

I mean, it's a very large foundation now and it should be used. It should be used for what its purpose was, which was to be there to assist and to allow certain things to happen, and now be even more aggressive about their commitments. I don't know how much support I would get, frankly, for that idea, but it's something that I've expressed for a long time.

Glaser: Well, as a past president, you're on the executive committee of the endowment fund, aren't you?

Swig: Right, exactly. For the last two years, I haven't been around, so I almost feel like I'm at a disadvantage doing this interview now, rather than going back and reading papers and trying to--. Just as we're talking and you're asking me particular things, what's surfacing is a singular idea when I know that if I had been here for the last two years and kept current, probably this interview would have more content to it.

Glaser: Oh, I think you're doing fine.

Swig: Well, I don't agree with you. I don't agree with you. I've been thinking about it, because there were a lot of things going on. I can talk in generalities, and I am not talking about specifics as much as I think something like this deserves.

KQED

Glaser: I wanted to ask you about the KQED problem you had during your presidency, because it was felt there was some insensitivity in the KQED programming. Were you on the KQED board at that same time?

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: That must have made it difficult for you.

Swig: Yes, but I was certainly glad I was on it.

Glaser: On which board?

Swig: On the KQED board.

Glaser: That added strength to what you wanted to say.

Swig: I think it made my role more valid, that I was there to hear and to be able to listen to the dialogue. There was an insensitivity

to the programming, and even though there was an argument about balance, the balance wasn't quite what they said.

So what did it do? It made everybody pay more attention, and there was a lot of conversation, there was a lot of testimony, and there were some additional programs. But I think everybody learned a lot. Certainly KQED learned about the response of the Jewish community, that it was interested, and it could point out the inequity.

Glaser: Did this lack of sensitivity come from prejudice on the part of certain people?

Swig: There might have been somebody on the staff at KQED who had a bias, for sure. For sure.

Glaser: In thinking back to what was in the press at the time, it seemed to me that Mr. [Tony] Tiano was very much on the defense about this.

Swig: He was. I would hesitate to point fingers and say that this was said or that was said, but he was definitely uncomfortable about this, and annoyed at the fact that his professionalism was being challenged. Mary Bitterman now is a different person, and once again, not having been here for the last couple of years I don't know--and also the circumstances are slightly less volatile--I don't know how she would have responded, but I think she would have responded differently. She's just a different kind of a personality.

Glaser: Of course, the fact of having come from Hawaii, where there are so many minority groups, perhaps it made her more open to that.

Swig: That's true. I think maybe it's just her own person. Tony was very good in lots of areas; he just couldn't handle this situation. And as you say, he immediately became very defensive, and he was defending his staff. So in his exploration of the problem, he could have done a better job.

XI A NEW FEDERATION EXECUTIVE**Wayne Feinstein**

Glaser: I wanted to ask you about the change in the executive of the Federation. You had to have that adjustment during your presidency.

Swig: You mean going from Brian [Lurie] to Wayne [Feinstein]?

Glaser: Yes. Would you talk about that?

Swig: It was a big change. It was a big change. The personality is completely different. Brian is today a risk-taker; he enjoys the big picture, and he loves challenging your thought process to make things happen. With the strategic plan, the whole idea of blue-skying was something that was really conceived by him. He likes that kind of thing, he likes to feel there is no end to what can be accomplished, and that if you don't think in those terms, then you lose opportunities. So you had that kind of a person, which sometimes led you down the primrose path, and you wondered about getting back. [laughs] Not everybody could handle that kind of thinking.

To Wayne, who is very bright as well, very bright, a very, very good thinker. However, he's much more cautious. Much more cautious, much more restrained in his thought process, in my opinion. Thoughtful about where he's going because he wants to be successful. They're not the same personalities, so I don't want to compare them. They're different. So the community changes with that. Wayne's certainly created relationships with the major donors, and I think kept secure the funding, which is key and very important to him. I don't know how successful he has been with his own generation, as far as bringing them in, in the numbers that I think we all need. Even though our campaign this year, I understand, was ahead of last year's. Whether that was volunteers doing it--I think Harold Zlot was very

conscientious about his work--or whether that was Wayne. I think Wayne is having big difficulties as far as senior staff. I think he's been involved with that ever since he's come here to his job.

Glaser: Has there been more of a turnover than normal?

Swig: There's been a lot of turnover, and then of course he also has cut back a lot of people. I don't know whether he is as good a delegator as he should be. But honestly, Elly, in some ways at this point I'm talking out of my hat, because I haven't been there on a day-to-day or even a month-to-month basis. I'll read the minutes; some of it's discouraging to me, some of it I take for norm.

Reaction to Report from Federation Retreat

Swig: Just leaping ahead: right now the Federation is going through its own self-investigation, trying to figure out who it is, what it is, what it wants to be. How it's going to go forward into the next years, which is right back where it was [laughs] with Larry Myers and the demographic study and so on. I brought this report that Alan Rothenberg brought over to me, which was the discussion that came out of the three-day retreat that they had in July. And as I look at it, in many ways they haven't moved very far.

They've had a lot of people thinking, and they've got some ideas, but as to whether or not they're really going to be willing to implement all of these to the extent that they need it. I mean, I found myself making some comments: [reads] "What's new--no guts, no glory. You've got to be a believer." Here, [reads from report], "Many more useful ideas are being considered in these committees." So I'm saying, "Well, what are they? Spell them out." They don't seem to spell out.

[looking through report] Interesting--oh, here's an insight of what the Federation--"The Federation needs to see itself as the Jewish community's instrument for rekindling Jewish community." I don't agree with that. I don't agree with that. I think it's getting right back to what I consider an arrogant stand.

Glaser: I thought the Federation was always considered the central address of the Jewish community, and isn't that what the statement you just read is saying?

Swig: "An instrument for rekindling Jewish community." This was a marketing person's insight, a letter from this woman to Wayne. Wayne also put out a paper in May, I think it was, where he said the Federation was the soul of the Jewish community. I don't agree with that. I think that creates a tension, and it is disallowing the importance of other entities, in particular the synagogue. I mean the synagogue should be the soul of the Jewish community. The synagogue, with the Federation, can rekindle the Jewish community. But for the Federation to see itself singularly as that today is retro and not being broad enough or big enough to say, "We are one of, and we have our mission, but it's inclusive of a relationship with, and together we go forward." I mean that is to me much more exciting.

Glaser: I think they need you back in the Federation, back on the board.

Swig: No, I don't think they really--. [reading to herself] Here's another: "To achieve these results, federations has to retool themselves with high-caliber professionals, individuals community leaders might have hired into their own business." So they're calling for all these skilled people that should be coming into the Federation, and I say, "This will not happen in the present CJF [Council of Jewish Federations]-controlled professional pool." When we hired Wayne, we hired within the pool of professionals that were presented to us by the CJF. If we would have attempted to hire outside, that person would have not been blackballed, but would have been slightly ostracized from the other professionals of federations nationwide. Sort of coming in and squeezing out a candidate who has been in the old boys' network. And so long as they continue to do that, federations are not going to see candidates that are the brightest and the best.

Glaser: Where are the brightest and the best?

Swig: Well, they're probably going into other areas where maybe their benefits are better, or maybe they're getting higher pay, or maybe their creative thinking is more welcome, and so on and so on and so on.

Glaser: That brings up a thought: are the schools of communal service doing a good job in training and bringing along people to fill these executive slots?

Swig: Where are the schools of communal service?

Glaser: There's one down in Los Angeles, there's another one developing or has developed at Brandeis University.

Swig: Okay, that's fairly new. They're fairly new. The one in Los Angeles, I don't know, is that part of the HUC [Hebrew Union College]?

Glaser: Yes.

Swig: I don't know. Interestingly enough, the Wexner Foundation has probably been singular in their efforts to address this issue and begin to raise the respect and standard level of potential communal workers to give them a path to succeed. They have funded it singularly.

Glaser: What do they do?

Swig: They have a selection process and training program for executives. Not only executives who are heads of federations but executives of agencies. They imbue them with Jewish tradition, and why they're doing what they're doing, and how they can do a better job. The foundation pays for them to do this; they don't have to pay. They respect them. It's like teachers. There's no respect for teachers today. It's that same attitude: Jewish communal workers do not have the respect of the Jewish audience that they should have, and that's a built-in problem.

But so long as they do this professional pool, where you have to pull from a pool, then there already is a limitation. There's no merit for real excellence to really shine forward. You're going to get in the pool, and eventually you're going to be hired by a federation as a federation executive. So the motivation is whether or not you're capable of going to a large city or a smaller city, but it's very limiting. I didn't like it at all when I found out that that was the way it worked.

Glaser: How many people were you allowed to consider?

Swig: I think we saw four people. [looking through papers] But this is interesting: "A staff organizational review conducted by Joel Daner of CJF pointed to our highly departmental culture and the need to create an organizational culture if we are to become an effective teaching Federation training future professional leaders for our system." I don't think that's our responsibility, not at all should we be a teaching Federation.

Glaser: This came out of the Federation itself?

Swig: This is, "Factors we must consider as we change: a discussion guide for leaders in JCF's [Jewish Community Federation] change process," that Wayne produced.

Glaser: Did Wayne alone produce this?

Swig: Yes, it's Wayne. He put this out. Here: "We must expand the circle of involvement with other stake holders, and especially donors, agencies, and synagogues and rabbis." Well, that's old news. "As soon as we're able to, in late October or November, we need to communicate broadly with the community on why we're attempting to change, what kind of changes we can foresee, and the timetables and process steps we're planning to take."

Glaser: Evidently you think this is just a lot of verbiage.

Swig: Well, it just means that nothing's happened in the last four years. Nothing happened--they keep on rolling. It's like a wave, and the wave dumps, and then they pick up the wave and they dump it again. There was a philosopher who said (I heard this the other day), "Come to the edge," and somebody says, "I'm afraid." He says, "Well, come to the edge." "I can't." He says, "Come to the edge," and they did, and he pushed them, and they flew. And that's what I'd like to see our community do. I'd like to see them come to the edge, get pushed, and fly.

Glaser: When you came to the end of your presidency, had you accomplished everything that you had set out for yourself as goals?

Swig: I thought we had accomplished quite a bit, because I felt we had broken new ground, particularly in the area of, as I say, the community development, which was really a key for me. I really felt that that was going to take hold. And then the next year, you know, they cut back. Now, it's almost as if it's the same thing all over again.

Here: "These ongoing calls for change in most instances anticipated the future search conference," which is what took place in July. "More rapid implementation was not possible because of internal resistance to change, absent a clear focus and a reason for change. Now leadership's task entails meshing these efforts to improve with a broader involvement of the stake holder community." And so on and so on and so on. I can go on and on.

XII TRIP TO UZBEKISTAN

United Jewish Appeal Mission

Glaser: Tell me about your trip to Uzbekistan in 1993.

Swig: We went to Uzbekistan because we decided that our community needed an on-site report of where our money was going in the Former Soviet Union, and how the Jews were being prepared to go to Israel.

Glaser: So this was part of the Operation Exodus?

Swig: Yes. And we felt that it was important to take that step, instead of just keep on reporting what we heard or have somebody else come and tell us.

##

Swig: We were lucky that there was a UJA mission that was going to Israel, and it had as a side trip a trip to Uzbekistan. It turns out that side trip was not very popular and was about to be disbanded. We came in when Wayne and I thought this would be an important thing to do. We just got in under the wire, and we said, "We've got four or five, six people who would like to go on that side trip." We didn't go with the mission; we just went on that side trip.

It was a very interesting trip, a hard trip but very interesting. So that was my visit into Uzbekistan. We were there for four or five days, and we visited the Jewish community, which was so interesting. The Bukharian Jews had been there since the third century and remain very well known and respected for their artistic and cultural achievements. Then we visited the Ashkenazi Jews, who had come as a result of all the distress during the Second World War, had fled Germany and had come into Russia. Some of them had gone up to Uzbekistan to get away from

Poland and Germany. I was very much taken by the Jewish community and their pride; warmth and sensitive natures--and their colorful dress.

Glaser: When you say Uzbekistan, that sounds like Outer Mongolia.

Swig: It does! [laughter] It does; I had never heard of it before. It was new, it was brand-new. You know, it was one of the Former Soviet Union republics that was born; there were about fifteen of them. But it was so romantic. I mean, here you had Tashkent and Samarkand, and Bukhara. We wanted to go to Bukhara, but we couldn't; the plane wasn't able to go in there.

Glaser: Did you fly first to Moscow and then take a plane?

Swig: No, no, we didn't go to Moscow at all. We flew to Frankfurt and Frankfurt into Tashkent. I think that's how we went. Then when we flew out, we flew with a planeload of Uzbek Jews going to Israel. El Al had started regularly scheduled flights, which was very exciting, into Tashkent. So we flew on an El Al plane to Israel with 175 Jews going to Israel from Uzbekistan.

Prior to departure we went around to the various embarkation points, private apartments, or community centers, and saw them preparing to leave: How they'd all gathered in these various buildings, and the goods that they were taking, and saying goodbye to their families--those who didn't go with their entire families, the reality that some of them would never return to Tashkent. This was a real separation. It was an incredible experience.

Glaser: It must have been very emotional.

Swig: It was very emotional and very touching, and very exciting. The young people were wonderful. We had a couple of visits with young people. They talked about how they were preparing to go, and many of them that we saw went on that plane. Very vital young people, going for the right reasons. They were all going on to either first year of university or the last year of high school. It was very exciting.

Glaser: Do you mean that these people that young, were leaving their families?

Swig: Well, they were seventeen, seventeen, eighteen. In some cases, their parents went with them, and in other cases they didn't. Because not everybody could go at one time, for whatever reason, and some of the parents were going to be joining them later. I would imagine that some of those young people probably would be trained to go back to the FSU [Former Soviet Union], or to

Moscow, or St. Petersburg to help to encourage others, or to teach Jewish culture.

I notice that in my work with the Joint now, in Israel the professionals go to the newer emigres or people who are speaking Russian and ask them if they would go back into their communities or to another community--hopefully their own community--and act as a Shaliach [emissary from Israel]. Sometimes they're heads of community centers, or they go in as camp directors, back into Russia and the Former Soviet Union, because not all the Russians are leaving. So they want to renew and resurrect Jewish culture. I would imagine that happens quite a bit.

XIII A CALL FOR CHANGE

Unmet Needs of Agencies

Glaser: I have a section that I wanted to ask you about, but I wonder if you haven't already covered it. "Calls for Federation and community changes." In the last year or so, there have been these calls. I would like your response to some of the quotes. For instance, Gary Tobin, director of the San Francisco-based Brandeis University Institute for Community and Religion, feels that dramatic changes must take place in Jewish organizational life. Do you agree?

Swig: I think dramatic changes should take place.

Glaser: I think this is what you have been saying, hasn't it?

Swig: Yes, right. And I've had an opportunity to talk with some of the leadership. I had a talk with Wayne when he was in Washington; I talked with him just before I came here. And I've recently talked to Alan Rothenberg, who came over, we had a long chat, just to prepare himself with his ideas. Susan Folkman called me. She and Richard Zipser are coming over. Richard, of course, was hired as a community development person when I was the chair. He's a very, very good person, and Susan is excellent.

They're giving me a chance to really think about some of these things that I'm concerned about and voice them. I know one of the major issues has to do with this expanded fundraising that is taking place in our community. Where agencies, because Federation is not raising enough dollars, and there have been so many government cutbacks and so on, that several agencies are forced to do their own fundraising. How this plays in the eyes of the general community, and how the agencies feel about it. How they feel about the value of Federation in not being able to satisfy all their needs. And the kind of tension that's growing as a result of that. There is a lot of tension. Particularly in

one of the agencies, the Jewish Family and Children Service, there's a tremendous amount of tension between the Federation and the agency.

I tell you this, and it's nothing new. I'm not divulging a problem, because it was a problem that was beginning to grow when I was chair, and it was one of the reasons that I started these agency luncheons, to try to air some of these concerns.

The Mature Agency

Swig: One thought I had was that if Federation wants to restructure or redo itself or really be relevant today, maybe, maybe, they should consider looking at what I would consider a mature agency and spin it off. Spin it off, and be proud of the fact that they could spin it off because it's a mature agency, and allow it to do what it has to do in order to survive.

Glaser: Could the Jewish Family and Children Services exist on its own? Could it raise enough money?

Swig: I think so, I think so.

Glaser: That's certainly a mature one.

Swig: Yes, and I think it certainly would be a wonderful model to attempt to do that, because Anita [Friedman] happens to be a very talented executive. The agency is a critical agency, and it can't be funded completely by Federation, so it has to do a lot of major fundraising on its own. I think it would be a very positive thing. I think it would be positive from the point of view of Federation saying, "Listen, if we want to be relevant, if we want to address issues, and we're not satisfying the needs, and we have a mature agency, then shake hands, be friends. Stay tied, however you want, tethered, whatever, but be proud of the fact that you've grown the agency, and it serves the community and is doing so well. Be proud of that, and look to that as sort of a beginning channel of how you can really birth something." And maybe there's another agency that they can do that with as well.

Then it doesn't disallow Federation. It allows Federation to concentrate on the agencies that can't survive on their own to do what they're supposed to do and to address the overall needs of the Jewish community, because there's a need for it. That's why you have an agency, an agency is there because there's a need. You stay friends with the one that you've spun off, and

there's opportunities to work together, but you allow it to have its own voice.

Community Needs

Glaser: Is there a need for an agency that does not exist at this present time? Are all needs covered by existing agencies? I mean this aside from the fact of whether you could afford it or not.

Swig: Yes, I understand what you're saying. Well, you have the JVS [Jewish Vocational Service], you have the Home. I think the only need that is not being covered substantially that keeps rearing its head is senior housing. I don't know whether you'd call that an agency or a project, but senior housing--Getting back to that little saying: we've always gotten to the edge, and we've never allowed ourselves to fly. I can remember it way, way, way, way back when some of the leadership down on the Peninsula wanted very much to have senior housing there; and a lot of talk, got to the point, nothing happened. And most recently, it was the same thing here. It just seemed to--. So maybe that would be a project that could be--.

The JCCs [Jewish Community Centers]: whether they're addressing all the needs at the JCC. By the way, this is another area within my time as chair where we had a real upheaval. JCC has been very vulnerable, I would say, for the last ten years. They've run a lot of debt and so on and so forth. They've been pushed back and forth, whether they're an individual place or whether they're part of the UJCC [United Jewish Community Centers], and they've just gone back and forth and back and forth. In the meantime, they have not been a viable institution. We went through very critical steps during that time, and it's still critical. Supposedly now they've brought in a well-respected administrator who has been given the task to try to bring the San Francisco JCC into some kind of line order.

Glaser: They need a new building.

Swig: They need a new building for sure, and they've got to make sure that the entity survives. We can't do without a JCC. The JCC is one of the cores of the Jewish community, I think.

Glaser: Right. I have two more quotes to get your reaction to.

Swig: Oh, yes.

Glaser: Another one by Gary Tobin: "The theme of Jewish continuity is not going to motivate people to give, but highlighting specific programs will." My question is, does this encourage designated giving to the detriment of the all-encompassing campaign?

Swig: The idea of Jewish continuity will not--?

Glaser: "Is not going to motivate people to give, but highlighting specific programs will."

Swig: I think I discussed that with you the last time, that I think designated giving is absolutely all right. However, it's designated giving that is done without sacrificing the core gift.

Glaser: Yes, we did talk about that.

Swig: And I continue to say that, that if you do it at the sacrifice of the core campaign, then I think you're destroying something that has a valid reason for surviving. I believe in federated giving, because there are needs that must be covered, and many of them are not directly impacting on yourself, but they're impacting on other members of the Jewish community. And Jews, I think, have got to serve all. So I believe in the organized Federation.

I think designated giving is very attractive to people today. I like the idea of designated giving, but if it comes at the sacrifice of an annual gift, then I think we're doing ourselves a disservice. So the answer is that you try to focus on people who are interested and help them to tailor a gift that is attractive to them and makes them feel that they're making a real contribution, and that they can be a part of.

Glaser: My last quote is from Leonard Fein. "Changes are seen in the way Jews see their communal responsibilities. Hence, less given to Federations."

Swig: Well, my answer to that is then if that's the case, then we have not educated our community properly to the mission of Federation, of federated giving. Communities change, things change. But this idea of why Jews have survived throughout the ages, and how Jews are constantly reaching out to each other--that's the mystique. That's really the mystique that has helped with our survival. To ignore that goes against our historic tradition. It's not just Jewish Americans' tradition; it's historic tradition. So I don't agree with that. I think we have to see why they are giving less to Federation and do a better job of responding to the answer of that, but also recognize the fact that people will want to give to specific things.

XIV FEDERATION AND WOMEN'S ISSUES

[Interview 4: August 27, 1996] ##

An Issue to be Addressed

Glaser: One time you mentioned you had wished the Federation had taken on women's issues.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: What happened to that?

Swig: Not much. [laughs] I guess what spearheaded that was, first of all, in the last five to ten years the issues pertaining to women have become much more visible or much more on the surface generally than in the past. As an individual, as an independent woman who was interested in those issues, I looked around to see whether or not organizations that I was involved with were aware of these and trying to deal with some of them. So that was one reason.

Particularly in the area of abuse to women, I became very interested in that through another vehicle, through another channel. It occurred to me that I had read several papers on the issue of abused women within the Jewish community, and that it had been kept submerged for, I'm sure, very political and religious reasons. In this day of information and awareness and the status of women and having women be equal, I felt that it was an issue that we should resurface, or surface, in our community. Because we are known as a thinking community and should be very open to this kind of discussion.

So I guess that was the genesis of it, as far as I was concerned, with the Federation.

Glaser: But how would the Federation have handled that?

Swig: I don't know. I was trying to focus then in the area of the Women's Division. The Women's Division has for the past several years been struggling to maintain their reason for being and to strengthen their agenda. I believe in women's independent giving and the fact that women can make their own decisions and so on and so forth. So I've always felt that there was a role for the Women's Division. However, their relevancy on the whole was beginning to sort of become soft because the role of women was changing.

There were women in the workplace, there were women who were not part of the thought process of the Women's Division in the same way it was when I was involved, when more women were at home and there was more informal time, when you could really get yourself involved. And now with women in the workplace, there wasn't that opportunity. Women in business--their needs and their issues were different and their giving patterns were different or expanded.

I know that the Women's Division had been struggling with how to deal with this, and they had been really trying hard. It occurred to me that here was an issue that they could look at and take on. In my opinion, it would give them a contemporary look or a contemporary agenda. Here was something that had been around forever, that up until several years ago wasn't being talked about, but now it was being talked about. Would this be something they could bring to a conference level where it was important enough for them to discuss and at least air? It may not be resolved, but at least aired.

Glaser: Was this within the Women's Division or when you were the Federation president and wanted to bring this before the board?

Swig: Well, when I was the president, I wanted to bring it before the board as something that we should take a look at, because there are women in our Federation across the board, and there were women on our board, and I thought it would be something that both men and women should be aware of. I didn't know exactly what the channel would be, whether it would be community development, whether it would be social issues within the Federation. I didn't know where it would land.

But then it occurred to me that this could be something that the Women's Division could take a look at, as something they felt was so important that it was worthwhile involving themselves in from an educational point of view.

Glaser: I see. But wouldn't the Jewish Family and Children's Services already be handling that?

Swig: They could have, but I don't know that it was necessarily to the broader audience. Whether you're involved with Family and Children's Services, or whether or not you're involved in X, Y, Z, as a woman in today's society, should it be an item that should be brought out of a particular agency and just discussed in an open forum?

Glaser: You were looking at this as an educational thing rather than social services.

Swig: Rather than social service but as an educational thing, because the awareness level was so low and yet it was so pervasive. It's very pervasive in the Jewish community worldwide. What spurred me on was that the Jewish women of Chicago were thinking in the same way maybe a year or so before. They were not getting action from the religious institutions, so they formed a group. What emerged from that group was a conference and a paper dealing with this very pervasive issue of domestic abuse in the Jewish home. It was a very, very thoughtful paper which everybody can get hold of now.

It sort of spurred me on and at the same time I knew that this was tackling a very delicate issue, but a very important issue, particularly as women are seeking to be an equal partner on a global scale. I thought it would give a leg up to the reason for being for the Women's Division, that it was something they could offer to their members on a very thoughtful level. And, if they wanted to take something else on as a project, that would be fine.

Partners Ending Domestic Abuse

Swig: What I also had in mind was I had become involved with this issue through my company. The company had been involved with a campaign that a major corporation had mounted through their foundation on the issue of domestic abuse in the Bay Area. This is an international corporation that manufactured women's clothing, and they were looking to help issues in major cities where they had businesses. They would go in and research what might be a major issue that was being underserved.

So they went into three cities, one of which was San Francisco, and they researched and found that second to AIDS domestic abuse was a major issue that was being underserved in San Francisco.

Glaser: Now, when you said your company--

Swig: When I had my consulting company, Roselyn C. Swig Artsource. I guess this was in '90 or '91, something like that.

Glaser: I see. I didn't know whether you meant the Swig family company.

Swig: No, my art consulting company. We got involved because there was an art component to the project, where they used fine art photographers to do major billboards. They interviewed people who had been abused, or they even interviewed people who were abusers, with photography and with text. They selected I don't know how many images, but they used five fine art photographers. They had 100 or 200 billboards that were all around the Bay Area for a month. They had this awareness campaign. We were asked to be involved as far as the art was concerned, and we just were drawn into the issue. I had all women working in my office and it just drew us in.

So we helped to start an organization called Partners Ending Domestic Abuse, which exists today. It works to do awareness programs and try to raise money to augment the budgets of the particular agencies that are dealing with the issue of domestic abuse in the City. There are about ten agencies. So that's what made me so sensitive to this.

And then, having read this paper that came out of Chicago and aware of what occurs in some levels of Jewish society, I thought, you know, why keep it under the carpet when we're bringing everything else out?

Glaser: Did you present this to the board?

Swig: I talked with Wayne [Feinstein], and I talked with Don Seiler, if I'm not mistaken, and I spoke with Phyllis [Cook] about it. As I recall, it was a matter of a lot of things on our plate, and how to really appropriately do this, and so it sort of floated. It floated.

First Jewish Women's Conference

Swig: Also, it was raised at the first Jewish Women's Conference. Do you remember they had--

Glaser: Yes.

Swig: The first Jewish Women's Conference was held at Golden Gate University. It was so interesting to me, they had every issue in the book at that conference. I mean, there were workshops on everything dealing with women, and one of them was with domestic abuse. I had just been involved with this campaign, and I went to it. That conference was completely sold out, and there were only twelve women who attended that workshop.

Glaser: Only twelve?

Swig: Only twelve. It was shocking to me. I mean, it just sort of confirmed what I was thinking. That is that people were very uncomfortable about talking about it, and it was very difficult to get a woman to come out and say that she has been abused. Domestic abuse is in the workplace and it's in the home. It's verbal, and it's physical, and it's economic--it's the whole range. It's very difficult unless there's a support system for a woman to come out and say that she has this problem, because she doesn't have anyplace to go.

So all of those issues were issues that I felt that a thinking Jewish woman should be thinking about. Either if a woman has been abused, to try to find support for her. Or that we as a Jewish community would show support for it and assist in that effort. Or that people would just become more aware. Some of our best friends are being abused.

Glaser: And we don't know.

Swig: And we don't know it. So anyhow, that was how that all started.

Glaser: Well, on to more--

Swig: The bottom line was that I had suggested to the Women's Division that they pick up this issue and be part of an opportunity to mount a conference where Partners would be the facilitator or the coordinating group. The Junior League and the Women's Division, and I would hope Mills College could even be the venue. And the Women's Division just never picked up on it. They just never picked up on it.

Glaser: I started to say on to more optimistic things. I wanted to ask you to talk about your being in Washington, D.C., at the time of the signing of the accord between Israel and the Palestinians.

Swig: Yes. Well, that was wonderful. That was just wonderful. It was really amazing, because here we all were together in the Rose Garden, or I guess it was the South Lawn, whatever. Arabs and

Jews alike, everybody clasping hands and embracing and so on. It was just amazing. [laughs]

Glaser: Something which you never thought you'd live to see, I presume.

Swig: Well, I had hoped that I would live to see it. I had hoped that I would live to see it.

XV MORE ON PRESIDENCY

A Period of Change

Glaser: Your report for the Federation's 1994 annual meeting was entitled "Riding on the Crest of Change." Did you feel your presidency was a period of greater change than the previous presidents had to face?

Swig: Than they had to face? Perhaps. Perhaps. The reason being that I think we made several breakthroughs. Their presidency might have been the lightning rod, or the symptoms of change were showing themselves, and so you build on that. In the area of financial resource development and in the area of community development, I think there were some changes made. I think Larry [Myers] and Don's presidency had to do more with strategic planning, or trying to get a strategic plan, or positioning the Federation. But I think mine had an opportunity to do some changing. And we had also changed--we had a new director.

Glaser: Can you give some examples of things that were changed within your administration?

Swig: Well, the area of community development, hiring a person to develop that, having an active agenda item that dealt with community development was a change.

Jewish Continuity

Glaser: Did you do anything about ensuring Jewish continuity? That became a very strong issue in the last few years.

Swig: The whole validity of the community development department within the Federation was dealing with how we were going to assure

Jewish continuity, and one way that we could hope to assure it was to be more inclusive of individuals to the Federation, to offer them something other than--[tape turned off because of noisy sirens]

Continuity has all kinds of little titles. You can say that Jewish education deals with continuity, you can say that play groups deal with continuity, you can say that religious programs deal with continuity. Everything leads to the continuation of something that you want to bring forward. The community development department's reason for being was to be able to allow the Federation to step away from what is their original mission, which was to raise funds, and take a look at how they could strengthen the soul of the individuals who were also working to raise funds. How can you do that, and how you can bring people in who wanted more than that? They weren't originally turned on by the fundraising aspect; their interest level wasn't in that direction; but they could be curious about other areas within the Jewish community. So how do you bring them in and offer them something that will help them, enrich their lives, and educate them to a future sense of responsibility for the other?

Glaser: Being away from San Francisco following your presidency, were you able to see changes that had been recommended, whether these were actually brought about? There were a lot of changes enumerated in your report.

Swig: Exactly, exactly. I had hoped that they were carried out. I have to say that I was far away, and I wasn't getting back as often as I thought I might. So there was really no opportunity unless Doug Heller or Wayne or Richard Zipser, whomever, would have been in touch with me in an organized fashion. I can't say that I was really on a month-to-month basis. If anything I have a feeling, but I won't know this, that when you step away from your presidency there's sort of a dip. It's been very intensive for two years and the next person comes on. You can't hang around. Obviously, if I would have been here, I would have gone to the board meetings, or I would have been on particular committees. Obviously I'd have been on the endowment committee. But when you're not here, then you don't have a chance to participate in those.

I have a meeting this afternoon with Susan Folkman and Richard Zipser, in fact. One of the questions I'm going to be asking them is how they feel, because both of those people were instrumental in helping to push forward a change. That was the change that I talked to you about last time, where we opened up the opportunity to work directly with the rabbis and to become friends, rather than have a tension. Susan was a leader there,

and Richard Zipser was there, as director of planning and allocations. I'm anxious to talk to them, and they're interested in talking with me and letting me know what's happening.

XVI CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

Possible Merger of Council of Jewish Federations, United Jewish Appeal, and the Jewish Agency

Glaser: One of the proposed changes that will affect the Federation is the coming together of the Council of Jewish Federations, United Jewish Appeal, and the Jewish Agency. This has been talked about for, oh, at least a year. Has anything happened with that?

Swig: I don't think anything is going to happen. I mean, it's happening. They keep talking and talking. They've certainly put a lot of time and a lot of energy in it, and it's gone from here to here to here [motioning], where it's in the last throes. But in getting to here, they now have to open it back up to the broader communities to see whether the community is in agreement with their final thinking. I will be a very surprised person if something concrete comes of that.

Glaser: Are you in favor of it?

Swig: No, I'm not.

Glaser: Why?

Swig: I think what they have done is they've created another bureaucracy. I think that the way it seems to be structured now, there is--[sighs]. I'll back up. In Jewish philanthropy, one of the important things is to provide roles for volunteers. That encourages people to get involved, it encourages giving, and so on and so forth. If you don't put that in place, then there would be a lot of people who probably would have been involved and be participating who might not be as involved and may not participate at the same level. So the role of the volunteer is very important in the whole overall scheme.

If you reduce that, then you run into that problem of having just a small executive suite. At the same time as being very efficient, you have a small executive suite. In taking a look or listening to the way the structure is presented now, they've created the same kinds of pods of volunteers. It's almost as if they've moved people around, but they haven't really changed, they haven't made it any more efficient. Plus, it calls for a huge board, just a huge board, like 100 and something. It keeps growing every time I hear it, and that's very inefficient. So as far as I'm concerned, all they've been doing is trying to protect jobs in the name of efficiency. That's my feeling of it. I'll be very surprised if it actually happens.

Glaser: You have a lot of vested interests on the part of those who are the professionals.

Swig: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. And frankly, I think this was professionally driven. I don't think it was necessarily volunteer-driven.

Glaser: Why would it be professionally driven when you have people losing their jobs?

Swig: Because I think people were afraid of losing their jobs. UJA was in very difficult straits, and was really a very costly kind of an organization to have. I think in many ways they were protecting themselves.

Glaser: I'm confused. How would they protect themselves by wanting to have this come about?

Swig: Because they were being usurped in many ways by the CJF, and the UJA has a better name nationally or internationally than the CJF. Nobody really knows the CJF outside of the CJF, but everybody knows the UJA. Whether it's Jew or non-Jew, they know of the United Jewish Appeal. It's been around for a long time. So that name would have to survive when all is said and done. But in the meantime, the UJA is primarily for overseas money, and overseas money was going down.

##

Swig: UJA had the name recognition, but you had the weakness in their fundraising mission. You had CJF that didn't have the same kind of name recognition, but they were serving the local needs, where the people were much more concerned, or growing more concerned, about the needs. So the idea would be then, all right, we should merge this into one, and it would be more cost-effective, and our dollars could be better spent, and so on and so on and so on.

Glaser: You'd have a smaller staff.

Swig: You should have a smaller staff. What I'm saying is that I have not taken a look at the ultimate staff structure, but I would suggest that it doesn't look much different.

Glaser: I see. It would still be as large.

XVII MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

National Vice President, Western Region, State of Israel Bonds

Glaser: I want to ask you about your organization memberships, and there have been many. First I'll ask about the Jewish community ones. You were national vice president of the Western Region for State of Israel Bonds. I think that's something you've been very involved in.

Swig: I was very involved; I have not been involved in the last several years. They have asked me if I would sort of keep my name there, but I'm certainly interested in it.

Vice President, Board of Trustees, Jewish Community Museum

Glaser: Vice president of the board of trustees of the Jewish Community Museum?

Swig: Yes, well, that's old. Did you just get that?

Glaser: No, I don't have any dates for that at all.

Swig: I was one of the founding members of the museum, so I've always been involved with it, but my role now is ex officio on the board.

Washington Action Office, Council of Jewish Federations

Glaser: You were active in the Washington Action Office of the Council of Jewish Federations.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: Are you still?

Swig: Yes.

International Board of Governors, Tel Aviv Museum of Art

Glaser: The International Board of Governors for the Tel Aviv Museum of Art.

Swig: Yes. That's almost an honorary type of thing. I mean it's a large international group.

Director, National Womens Division and Member of National Board of Directors, United Jewish Appeal

Glaser: Well, now I have some dates for you. In 1971 you were director of the National Women's Division of the UJA, and on the national board of directors.

Swig: In 1971? Yes. Where did you get this list? From us?

Glaser: From the Federation.

Swig: I should give you an up to date--. [tape interruption]

National Vice President, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)

Glaser: Talk about your role in AIPAC, please.

Swig: Oh, I love AIPAC, I love AIPAC. I enjoyed very much being an officer of AIPAC. I hated to give that up, and I had to give it up when I took this job with the government. I have such respect for what AIPAC does, and I loved the opportunity of being close to the political action, and to be kept aware of the activities between the United States and Israel. I enjoyed all the personalities and the personalities of the various officers on the board.

Glaser: Now you're talking on the national board?

Swig: The national, yes. So I was very proud to be able to be an officer, and I really got a lot out of it. It taught me a lot, and all the people that you meet, on the Israeli side or the U.S. side, are really very dedicated. You may not always agree with them, but they're very dedicated to the issues.

National Commission on Jewish Continuity

Glaser: In 1993 you were a member of the National Commission on Jewish Continuity, and I would think that goes right along with your Federation presidency.

Swig: Yes. I will tell you that it was hard for me to attend those meetings. They were usually in New York, and I had a lot of conflict as far as dates were concerned, so I can't say that I was really a contributing member. Marvin Lender was the head of that, if I'm not mistaken.

Joint Distribution Committee of State

Glaser: And you're a board member of the Joint Distribution Committee.

Swig: Yes, and I enjoy that very much.

Glaser: Are you still on that board?

Swig: Yes. I forget how long I've been on there.

Glaser: I have the date of 1994 for your board membership.

Swig: That's right. And I head the Former Soviet Union committee, which is very, very interesting. What they do is they divide the board. You sign up for a particular area of the Joint's work--Asia, Africa, Europe, Russia, et cetera. So I was on the Former Soviet Union committee, and then I was asked to be chair last year. It's very interesting work.

The Joint has been an organization that I've known since I first started in Federation. Early on in Federation, the Joint was a very, very, very, very visible part of Federation and their campaigns. It is just such a life-saving, selfless group of

people and programs. It was interesting, that it suddenly went off the radar scope of our federation. They didn't use it the same way they did early on, which was very strange to me. I think something political happened within the organization where Joint was just not talked about in the same way. It was sort of broad-brushed with other overseas programs.

I would say in the last three years it's become very visible again. They are doing such an intense job in implementing their programs and really are action-oriented, that the UJA, which is looking for something to attract the attention of its potential donors, is suddenly using the Joint to show where the dollars go. So I've seen it go like this [motions], and then gone silent, and now becoming very visible again.

Glaser: I would think with what has happened in the former Yugoslavia that that would highlight its need.

Swig: Well, it did, it did. In Sarajevo, as you probably know, our government used the Joint to distribute food packages. The Joint was the only organization in place there that had a structure to be able to do that. I think it was a year ago Christmas when the United States government called the Joint and said, "Would you handle this for us?", which they did. But they've had very dramatic situations in Sarajevo, that whole area is bad.

XVIII ACTIVITIES IN GREATER COMMUNITY

Roselyne C. Swig Artsource

Glaser: I want to ask you about your community activities, and I think most of them have been in the realm of art and culture. Why don't you start out by telling me about forming your own business?

Swig: All right. I started my business in 1978, '77 or '78, and it came out of some work I had been doing as a volunteer at the San Francisco Art Institute.

Glaser: Were you on the board of that?

Swig: Yes, I was on the board, I was the head of it. I had a long history there. I was there as an active volunteer for sixteen years, and I had gone through all their organizational groups, and ended up as the chair.

Glaser: Also, you were a commissioner and past president of the San Francisco Arts Commission.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: So you really did have quite a background for starting your own business, Artsource.

Swig: Well, I started it because I saw a need to bring artists and potential audience or clients together, particularly in the contemporary arts. I noticed that the community was apprehensive in many ways about the contemporary arts here. I thought, I know these artists, they're terrific, they're human beings with families, with problems. Everybody wants to make a living, they have to send their children to school and so on. The public doesn't see them that way; they see them as sort of La Boheme characters.

I thought maybe I could act as a bridge between the public and the artist. Do a little bit of subliminal education, and help the artists with getting their art out in the market, and help potential clients by educating them in the area of the visual arts, and satisfying themselves with something very interesting.

So that's how I started. I just decided I would be a consultant. And I was very fortunate, because my first client was a major corporation that was--[tape interruption--sirens]

Glaser: Who was your first client?

Swig: It was Shaklee Corporation, and they were moving from the East Bay to San Francisco. They had a president who was very interested in making a statement in the City and wanted to do that with the visual arts. They were going to put an art collection into their corporate headquarters and they became my first clients.

Glaser: How did they come to you?

Swig: Through a mutual friend, somebody who was on their board [Claude Ganz]. It was just very, very fortunate for me. So that sort of launched the company. Then we had private clients, and we had public clients, cities, and we had corporate clients. We started something called Art Talk, which was a monthly program in our offices that we could offer our clients. We would bring in a major art person. It could be an artist, or it could be a director, or it could be a collector, or it could be an educator.

That person would make a presentation to what was a very small group, the maximum we could hold in our conference room was maybe sixteen, eighteen if we squeezed. It was like a little oasis in the day. We would have a buffet lunch, and during lunch the presenter would speak on a particular subject. People asked questions that they probably wouldn't ask in another environment, but they felt protected in that environment. We did that for, let's see, six or seven years, and it was really quite nice. It was really before everybody else was doing it, so it was sort of unique.

Glaser: How much staff did you have?

Swig: I had a secretary, and then I added another consultant. And then at the very end we had three other consultants, and a bookkeeper, and secretary.

Glaser: You said at the very end, isn't it still in existence?

Swig: No, I had to sell it when I took my job. The women who were working for me put together their own business plan, and they bought the company.

Glaser: What is it now?

Swig: Well, this is just my office. We were over in 45 Belden, and when I was going off to Washington, that same year we were coming to the end of our lease. I had to sell my company, and the women couldn't afford to stay there. They were young women, they didn't know what their future was going to be and so on. So we got an extension from our landlord for about three or four months to make a decision of what to do. In the meantime, they researched and they found this building with relatively modest rent. And so they said, "There's still some space in this building, why don't you take a look?" So I came over here. I wanted to continue to have my own private office, even though I no longer had the company.

Glaser: Looking at your shelves of books and your paintings here, I assumed that you still had your business.

Swig: No. This is the library I accumulated in all those years, but these are just art works that were there, that belong to me.

Glaser: At a time when you might come back, or when your job for one reason or another in Washington is no longer in existence, would you pick up again with art?

Swig: I don't think so. I would like to do something, and I'd like to be actively in business, but I don't think it would be in the art consulting area again. My clients that I had, the women of Artsource (they call it Artsource) have carried on and retained them, and then they've added more clients on to them. So it would be difficult for me. Maybe I could go back in with them, but I think maybe I'd like to try something else. [laughs] I've got a lot of curiosities.

Director, Art in Embassies Program, U.S. Department of State

Glaser: Tell about what you do in Washington, D.C. What is your title, first of all?

Swig: It's called Director of the Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State. It is a program in which we borrow art, of American artists only, from individuals and institutions,

museums, foundations, galleries, corporations, the artists themselves, collectors. We borrow American artists' work, and we place the art work in the residences of our U.S. ambassadors when they go abroad. The program is considered part of the ambassador's mission at post. It's part of what he or she brings on behalf of our government to the host country. So it showcases the art accomplishments of our country's artists. It educates and it enhances. It's a wonderful opportunity for an outreach.

Glaser: Had this position originated with you?

Swig: No, it's a program that was started in 1964 by Nancy Kefauver. She was the first director.

Glaser: Senator Kefauver's wife?

Swig: Yes. It became a political appointment in 1986, and my predecessor was a young woman who was appointed by President Bush. She came from Houston, Texas. Then I succeeded her.

Glaser: Do you travel abroad on this program?

Swig: Sometimes, sometimes. There are eight people in my office. Three of them are called curators, and they work directly with an ambassador who is going to be going off to post. What we do is develop collections for each one of the ambassadors, based on the ambassador's requests or tastes, what they would like to see hanging in their residence. So it could be northwest Indian art, or it could be contemporary art--late 20th century. It could be early 20th century, or late 19th century, or even early 19th century. So whatever they want. It could be all glass if they wanted it.

The idea is to get a personal collection that they feel engaged in, they feel good about, and they get very excited about it. They love the program. They use it as a talking point. You know, if you're a visitor, you come into the ambassador's residence for--that's where all the official functions take place abroad. Not in the offices but in the residences. So if you have a group coming in and you want to break the ice, it's very nice to be able to walk up and say, "Oh, I'll tell you about this painting, or this object," and they love it. They just love it.

I assign a curator to particular ambassadors, and they work with them. Then we all use our networks to try to think of sources for art work that they would like. We get it all together, get it all packaged, and send it off to their post. We insure everything; there's no cost to our lenders. It's very nicely done, very efficient, very cost-efficient. Sometimes

there are catalogues that are printed the funding of which is raised by the ambassadors. That's a very nice perk for the artist or for the lender.

Glaser: This sounds like a fabulous job, because you're meeting people all over the country.

Swig: It's a lovely job, yes. It's a lovely job. I'm just planning a trip now, I've been invited to Fiji to speak. The ambassador there has started an American--what does he call it?--"Americans in Fiji" program. He invites personalities or people that are in particular areas that are of interest to the Fiji community. They've asked me to come down and talk about the program, so I'll go down there. Then I'm going to go to Manila, and then I'm going to go from Manila to, I think, Djakarta and to Singapore.

Glaser: You're going to hit all the hot spots, literally, in terms of climate.

Swig: I know it. It really never gets too cool down there. But I'll do that from time to time. Sometimes I'll go and install a collection. I'll be installing the collection that's going to Manila. Sometimes the curator will go and install the collection, or sometimes nobody goes to install the collection, and we just rely on local professionals to assist in doing that. It varies, because we can't do everything, we don't have that kind of a budget. It's a program that Americans really should be very proud of because it really does a lot.

Board Member, San Francisco Opera Association

Glaser: Let me ask you about some of the other things in the San Francisco community. In 1972, you were on the board of the San Francisco Opera Association.

Swig: Yes. I was on until this past year. [laughs] I was probably the oldest board member--no, Prentis Hale was the oldest one. I was next, I think, or the longest board member, in years.

Glaser: How did the board function?

Swig: For years as a rubber stamp. [laughs] Then it became a little more active. I served on the finance committee for a couple of years, but it really was like a rubber stamp for many years.

Glaser: Because of Mr. Adler?

Swig: Yes, yes.

Glaser: I gather he was a very strong personality.

Swig: Very strong personality. And also there was the president and the executive committee who were pretty much calling the shots.

Vice Chairman, Fine Arts Advisory Committee, Federal Reserve Board, Chairman, 2001-

Glaser: In 1979, you were on the Fine Arts advisory committee for the Federal Reserve Board in Washington.

Swig: I'm still on that, and now I'm vice president of it.

Glaser: Is that parallel with what you're doing in the State Department?

Swig: It's completely different. It's just like being on the board of the Opera Association. You're invited to be on the board. It's a small board.

Glaser: I don't quite understand what this--

Swig: Before Arthur Burns became the head of the Federal Reserve, he had been the ambassador to Germany. He was really overwhelmed by the beauty of the art in the offices abroad that he visited, whether it was in business or whether it was in government and so on. He was dismayed that the U.S. government didn't have that same emphasis on the arts. When he came back to head the Federal Reserve, he looked around and saw that there were a lot of bare walls, and so he initiated an art program within the Federal Reserve, which was pretty creative, I think.

Mary Ann Goley, who is still the director of it, was hired, and there was a small group of maybe eight or ten people who were asked to serve as an advisory group to encourage people to contribute paintings to this program. Then Mary Ann slowly began to develop exhibition programs, for just the employees of the Federal Reserve, which number a couple thousand. So it wasn't open really to the public. It was just for the Federal Reserve people.

Nathan Cummings was on the board, and he put my name forward as someone who might be interested.

Glaser: How did he know you?

Swig: We've known the Cummings family for years, just for years. Nate and Ruth Cummings, his wife, were friendly with my father-in-law and mother-in-law. They were at our wedding. And we've known their family. They might have been looking for somebody from California, and he knew I had an interest in the arts. Anyhow, he put my name forward. So I said yes.

It was very difficult to get back for the meetings. They were all held in Washington, and it was just very difficult. I went to a couple, and finally I wasn't going. After years, and Nate had gone off the board, I finally said that it really wasn't very responsible of me to do that. So I went off. Then maybe after about three years, they asked me if I would come back on. The timing was good, because I was just about to go off to Washington; that was in '92. I knew I was going to be going there, '92-'93, so I went back on and now I'm the vice chair.

Glaser: I think that's a feather in your cap, to be asked for that.

Swig: Well, it's nice. There's not a lot of activity, so it's pretty easy. It's a nice group of people.

Art Table

Glaser: You were a member of Art Table?

Swig: Yes, I am still.

Glaser: What is that?

Swig: Art Table is an organization for professional women in the arts. Women who are not necessarily artists but who have some relationship with art. It could be as a gallery owner, it could be as an educator, it could be as a conservator, it could be all kinds of things. It's a wonderful organization, and it's nationwide. They have chapters, not in every city, and you have to request to become a chapter. I joined here and then recently I joined in Washington. In fact, several of us were instrumental in starting the chapter in Washington. I don't know if you know Diane Frankel.

##

Swig: She was a presidential appointee and is head of the Institute of Museum Services, which is in the same triangle with the NEA [National Endowment for the Arts] and the NEH [National Endowment

for the Humanities]. She's outstanding. Here she was head of the museum management at the New School or the New College in the East Bay, and then she was the first director of the Discovery Museum, the children's museum in Fort Baker. We've become very good friends. Her husband is Chuck Frankel, and they moved themselves to Washington and will probably be there through--well, at least for another year, I don't know. Her term will be renewed as well.

Board Member, California State Summer School for the Arts

Glaser: You're on the board of trustees of the California State Summer School for the Arts.

Swig: Yes. I was a charter member. I was appointed by Willie Brown, in fact, when he was assemblyman. I was the appointee for his slot. That was a very interesting school that acknowledges young people in the junior and senior years of their high school who are excelling in the arts. And that ranges from dance to music to theater to film to painting, sculpture, and so on. It's housed now in southern California. I think for the last several years it's been at Cal Arts in Valencia. It's just nirvana for these young people. I'm not active; they've kept me on their board list. I think I was their first chairman, if I'm not mistaken; first or second chairman.

Board Member, American Council for the Arts

Glaser: I think I've skipped one here. In 1981, you were on the board of American Council for the Arts?

Swig: Yes, the ACA. I went off of that several years ago. It's a do-good organization that deals with arts and education and publishes books on these subjects.

Glaser: Is that local?

Swig: No, it's in New York.

Glaser: You've had a lot of activities going on in New York.

Swig: Well, you know, fortunately or unfortunately, those organizations are in these communities where there's a lot going on. I'd love

it if they were in San Francisco, but San Francisco doesn't have that same breadth in their organizations. I tried to get a chapter established here, but it was just very difficult because it was all emanating out of New York, and still does, even though their representation is from all over the country. They have a lobbyist in Washington, they have a wonderful advocacy day in Washington, and they have a lecture called the Nancy Hanks Lecture, which is very well attended. And then they have a major fundraiser in New York every year. That's what they're about.

Member, San Francisco Public Library Commission

Glaser: One of the few, or perhaps the only non-art position you were appointed to by the mayor is to the San Francisco Public Library Commission.

Swig: Yes. And I was fired, too. [laughs]

Glaser: Oh! Tell me about that.

Swig: All of us as commissioners were fired, with the exception of one. Mayor Jordan wasn't giving enough monies to the branch libraries, and we wanted to consolidate the library so that we could at least have viable branch libraries, rather than just have nothing, because you had too little everywhere. He didn't like our proposal, we challenged him, he challenged us, and he fired us.

Glaser: That sounds like an honorable firing to me.

Swig: Yes, we thought it was an honorable firing. We thought it was a big mistake on his part.

Boards of Local Art Institutions

Glaser: You've talked about being on the board and past president of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Swig: No, I'm on the board, but I'm not the president. I was past president of the San Francisco Art Institute, and I was past president of University Art Museum at Berkeley.

Glaser: I don't have that one on the list of your community activities.

Swig: You don't have that one? Well, that's on this one here. In fact, I was the first president of the University Art Museum at Berkeley when the chancellor formed a real board of directors. They asked me to go on the board, and I was asked to be the first chair.

Glaser: I'll take that back, because when I said you'd already mentioned it, I was thinking about the Art Institute. Let's talk about the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. Were you involved with fundraising for this new one?

Swig: Yes. I ran the second campaign, the second phase, which was a \$15 million campaign. I was involved with the first phase but not as the chair of the campaign. I was involved as chair with the second phase. I've been involved with the museum probably since '80. I forgot what the dates are, '82?

Glaser: I have '85. I don't know if that's the right date.

Swig: It probably is right. It was sort of a natural extension, leaving the Art Institute and so on. I believe in the institution. I think it's doing a good job.

Glaser: As a member of the board, did you have any input as to the architectural design?

Swig: I didn't. I was not on that committee. There were five or six people that were on, maybe a little bit more. I didn't have input there.

Glaser: It's a wonderful building.

Swig: Yes, it's a great building. The architect is a very nice man, Mario Botta, and he has really given himself to the success of the museum building. Very nice man.

Trustee, UC Berkeley Foundation

Glaser: I've got you down as 1981-88, trustee, University of California Berkeley Foundation.

Swig: Oh, that's the Berkeley Foundation, right. When I served as the president of the [Berkeley] museum, then they asked me to be on the Berkeley Foundation representing the museum.

Trustee, Mills College

Glaser: In 1986 you were on the board of trustees for Mills College.

Swig: Right.

Glaser: And on the nominating committee, development committee, search for a new president committee, planning committee for women's leadership conference.

Swig: Right. And I've just gone off of that board, I've rotated off.

Glaser: Please talk about your involvement with Mills College.

Swig: Oh, I loved it, I just loved it. I believe in women's colleges, and I think they have a role to play. Just following along with my interest in raising the awareness level of how responsible women are, and the role they can play, and so on. Their whole way of educating, and what they can teach the general community and certainly the male community, as far as women's qualities for leadership in all fields of interest. So I enjoyed being at Mills and having that opportunity to learn a lot.

Glaser: Were you involved several years ago when there was a sit-down strike and a great deal of unrest there?

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: I think Warren Hellman was the head of the board. Could you talk about that?

Swig: That specific incident had to do with the decision of the board to go co-ed. That decision was based on the financial situation, and also taking a look at the changing population or the numbers of women enrolling in women's colleges. Whether or not Mills could maintain its viability--what they would have to do in order to do that. So the idea of becoming a co-ed school arose. It was a liberal arts college that had a good record and could be attractive to men and women alike.

I was in the minority position on that. I felt that Mills would lose its uniqueness, obviously. There are a lot of liberal arts colleges, certainly on the West Coast, and it wouldn't necessarily add to Mills' attraction, because you can go lots of places and get a good liberal arts education. The students really chose to confront the decision, and the alumni also confronted the decision.

What came out of that was very positive. First of all, the board of trustees in their wisdom decided that they would change their minds. However, there were some qualifications, and one of the qualifications was that the board said that they would commit to five more years. During that five years, this had to happen and this had to happen and this had to happen as far as enrollment, and also in fundraising. The alumni had to become much stronger and much more active in the fund raising and development in general. Students had to become their own advocates and be active as far as helping other students to enroll, reaching out as spokespeople. There were lots of qualifications.

That's when Warren got all of his visibility. He was a great chairman; he was a good chairman.

I also enjoyed being on the search committee because I liked Mary--when I came in Mary Metz was the president. I was there through that change and the hiring of Janet Holmgren, who I like so much. She's just a wonderful, wonderful educator, and I think she has done a superb job.

Member, California Insurance Commissioner's Advisory Board

Glaser: In 1987, you were a member of the National Association of Female Executives?

Swig: It was a business group.

Glaser: And here's one that puzzles me: you're a member of the California Insurance Commissioner's Advisory Board?

Swig: Right, that was when John Garamendi was insurance commissioner. That's not in existence today. I think that comes under "past." But he formed an advisory group.

Glaser: It doesn't sound as if it goes along with all your art interests.

Swig: No, but he knew I was interested in politics, and we had supported him and so on, so that was it. It had nothing to do with art at all.

Glaser: Obviously not. How active were you in it?

Swig: Just advisory. He would gather the group together maybe twice a year to talk about the issues and try to get some feedback, if

there was something that--a little flag here or there. I kept him in touch with his supporters.

Member, Governor's Advisory Board, California-Israel Exchange

Glaser: In 1992, Governor's Advisory Board member, California-Israel Exchange.

Swig: Yes. That was Governor Wilson; that's still a viable group. I haven't participated in it the last several years, but as far as I know, it's still viable. Gordon Moore was the chair, Rosalie Zales staffed it, as an advisor to Wilson.

San Francisco Foundation, Special Awards Committee

Glaser: You're a member of the Special Awards Committee of the San Francisco Foundation.

Swig: I was. I was. I rotated off of that as well. That's a very nice group with which to be involved. What you do is you sort through so many applications of organizations or individuals who should be acknowledged for what they're doing in the community in particular areas. For instance, there's the Robert Kirkwood Award, there's a Dan Koshland Award, there's the John May Award, and each one of them has different criteria for acknowledgement. So then you sit with your colleagues and go through applications that are presented of organizations or individuals, and then make the decision.

Glaser: I was very surprised to read in their annual report this year that Robert Fisher was resigning. He's a fairly young man to be resigning. I was wondering what he was going to be doing next.

Swig: Right. Well, I think he's looking to do something. He felt that there was another ten years left of him, and if he was going to leave, that this was a good time, because the Foundation was in good stead, and so on and so on. And that he could offer himself to another organization for a full term. I like him a lot.

Local Liaison, Foreign Diplomatic Travel Program

Glaser: You were local liaison--and I have no date for this--the Foreign Diplomat Travel Program.

Swig: Oh, that was way back in the sixties and seventies, and that was also an ideal organization that was funded through private funding, corporate funding. It emanated out of the East Coast. Its mission was to take diplomats from the United Nations or from embassies in Washington D.C. who were serving their countries, to take them on a trip someplace in America. Because what was apparent was that there was not enough country budget to really tour the United States, so most of them only knew America by the eastern corridor. This program invited the present ambassador to come on a ten-day or two-week trip. If the ambassador couldn't come, then he or she could invite the minister or whoever was down the pecking order.

So you had a group of maybe thirty people who traveled together. There was no formal protocol, even though they had protocol amongst themselves, but there was no formal protocol. They got a chance to see the South, Southwest or the Northwest or the West Coast or the Midwest in a very intimate way, because they stayed at private homes. They stayed at hotels and they stayed at private homes for a couple of days. Dick and I arranged all of their program in San Francisco.

Glaser: That must have been interesting.

Swig: Oh, we loved it. We had a great time, just a great time, it was wonderful. We had some wonderful experiences, and met outstanding foreign service people, some of whom we've maintained contact.

Awards

Glaser: In 1995, you were given the St. Vincent de Paul Society's Frank Brennan Award for Services to the Poor.

Swig: Yes. I think that just all came about, frankly, as a result of the domestic abuse situation.

Glaser: Have you received any other awards that I don't have a listing for?

Swig: As a result of that, you mean?

Glaser: No, no, I mean in general.

Swig: I think it's all in there, Elly.

Glaser: Is there anything that you want to talk about?

Swig: Well, there are several Jewish awards.

Glaser: You have the first annual Chai Award given by the San Francisco-based Jewish Community Federation.

Swig: Yes. That was the Women's Division.

Glaser: Business Arts Council of San Francisco gave you a Chamber of Commerce Business Leadership Award in 1991.

Swig: Yes. That was a very nice award.

Glaser: You have an honorary MFA and an honorary doctorate of fine arts degree from San Francisco Art Institute. That must have really made you feel good.

Swig: Yes, very nice, very, very nice.

Glaser: And the Civic Commitment Award in 1989 from the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League.

Swig: Yes.

Glaser: State of Israel Bonds Woman of Valor Award, 1983. Hadassah's, Myrtle Wreath Award, 1982. And Advocates for Women honoree at their Annual Moving-Up Luncheon in 1981. Would you talk about that?

Swig: Well, that's exactly what it was. Women's advocacy was beginning to be something that people were becoming more active in, and I was asked to be one of the recipients.

Glaser: So Advocates for Women is an organization?

Swig: Yes. I really don't know if they're still doing that right now.

Glaser: But it is an organization?

Swig: It was.

Glaser: You've received some very fine honors.

Swig: I should say. And I guess I'm going to be honored in March, the Partners are giving me a first annual award.

Glaser: What partners?

Swig: The Partners Ending Domestic Abuse are going to have an event in March, and they've asked me to stand to be honored for that, so that's very nice and very meaningful.

XIX A SUMMING UP

Ideas for Federation's Future

Glaser: What do you see in the Federation's future?

Swig: I think the Federation will survive. I hope it will take a look at itself and take a bit of a risk as far as the role it is playing and can continue to play in encouraging inclusion and encouraging the next generation to feel the importance of carrying on. I think there's a coterie of potential leaders, not even potential but young leaders, that if they are respectfully brought together and listened to, will really provide the basis for 2000, or even for '99, '98.

I think the buzzwords may be a little bit different, but if staying with the basic issues, life's issues, they're not going to change. People are getting older, children are still being born, Jewish education is still important. A place to meet is very important, where people can meet and greet; so your Jewish Community Center is very important. Opportunities of bridging the community are very important. So you have the JCRC [Jewish Community Relations Council] and you have the Jewish Museum. Ways of addressing people who may not be comfortable or involved in one can be involved with the other. Educating the community to responsibility for Israel. I think Israel is always going to be there. You and I have discussed the kind of role that can strengthen that relationship.

I think providing young and older people alike with an opportunity to visit Israel at a comfort level for them, meaning that if the ticket is too high you make it easy for them to get there, so that they can at least feel the attachment. And if they make a second trip, they'll make it on their own. But certainly getting there, I think that's very important. Make it a treat to get there, and make it easy, and I think that's

perhaps where the endowment, and other endowments around the community can play a role.

I think the Federation would be very wise to see itself as a well of creative thinking and not be afraid to change, and I use the word change in a positive way. But I do think that they'll survive.

Satisfaction in Career and Volunteer Activity

Glaser: You have had such a full life as a volunteer and as a business woman. In all those years, what has given you the most satisfaction?

Swig: I think the most satisfaction I've had is in sort of reaching out and connecting with people. From the point of view as a Jewish woman, certainly being helpful to our community, but also sharing that kind of information with the non-Jewish community when I have a chance. But I think the opportunity of really interacting with people gives me the most pleasure, I really enjoy it.

Glaser: Is there something else you'd like to add?

Swig: I guess I should end by saying, and you've asked me this, I was very proud to be the head of the Federation. It was in many ways a culmination of my work with the Federation, having served in all kinds of capacities and having been the head of the Women's Division, so it was a nice way to culminate. I didn't intend that it would culminate in the way that I left town immediately, [laughs] so that was sort of a surprise. I hope I was able to play a substantial role, and that I could, if I didn't make change, at least initiate the opportunity for thinking about positive change. Thank you for doing this.

Glaser: Thank you very much, Cissie, I've enjoyed this chance to talk with you.

TAPE GUIDE--Roselyne C. Swig

Interview 1: August 16, 1995	1
Tape 1, Side A	1
Tape 1, Side B	14
Tape 2, Side A	25
Tape 2, Side B not recorded	
Interview 2: August 13, 1996	35
Tape 3, Side A	35
Tape 3, Side B	44
Interview 3: August 20, 1996	51
Tape 4, Side A	51
Tape 4, Side B	60
Tape 5, Side A	69
Tape 5, Side B not recorded	
Interview 4: August 27, 1996	76
Tape 6, Side A	76
Tape 6, Side B	86
Tape 7, Side A	98
Tape 7, Side B not recorded	

APPENDIX

Postscript by Roselyne Swig	111
Roselyne Chroman Swig curriculum vitae	118
Memo, August 15, 1969	122
Women's Division, list of presidents and campaign chairmen, n.d. [probably 1972]	123
Social Scene, <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , June 22, 1972	124
"Report on Status of Implementation of Strategic Plan," March 1992	125
"Cissie Swig, in conversation with Mandy Behbehani," <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> , September 13, 1992	131
"Roselyne C. Swig Report to the JCF Board Trip to Tashkent and Samarkand, FSU," October, 1993	134
"Riding on the Crest of Change," A Special Report by Roselyne C. Swig, President, to the Jewish Community Federation Membership, for the Annual Meeting, June 16, 1994	139
"JCF Speech," JCF Annual Meeting, June 16, 1994	156
"Cissie Swig, outgoing JCF head, joins Clinton team," <i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , June 17, 1994	164
<i>The American Benefactor</i> (partial article), Spring 1997	165
"Patriarch Richard Swig: 'He was just larger than life'," <i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , October 3, 1997	166
"Russian Jews now have a cultural home as well," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , June 4, 1998	168
"Roselyn[e] 'Cissie' Swig tapped for U.S.-Israel commission," <i>Jewish Bulletin</i> , December 8, 2000	169

APPENDIX--Postscript

In observing the chronology of my involvement with the Federation, it is easily apparent that from the beginning of my young adulthood/married life I was prepared to make a total commitment to working for the betterment of the Jewish community. I was happy to have the chance to be involved. It provided me as well with a base for establishing relationships that have lasted to this day and a window to educating myself to the needs and values of maintaining a strong Jewish service network both in the Bay Area and in Israel. It is also apparent from the chronology that I was in place at a time of much change in attitudes and in structure and in the breadth and depth of programs and fields of interest, beginning with the role of women as volunteers, in leadership and as independent funding sources.

I am very proud and feel very fortunate to have played a role in the growth and strength of the roles of women. As well I'm grateful for the opportunity it afforded me to develop my own value system and my sense of self--my own individuality. I give credit always to the foresight and vision of my peers in the Women's Division who recognized early on the value of education, educating oneself to the reason we were doing what we doing what we were doing. Being creative in seeking ways to express ourselves and to encourage others by setting examples that could be followed.

One of the most significant was the group dynamics program that was initiated in the late fifties or early sixties and which pushed the Women's Division forward by "growing" future leaders and strengthening our commitments to our "jobs." This led to encouraging the general Federation to use these educational tools in retreats and other study programs and to placing "education" as an important component to leadership, fundraising, and overall community development. However, it did not catch hold to the point that leadership programs and "education" became a line item in the annual budget of the Federation as related to board members, key leaders, etc., due to the traditional thinking that Federation's role was to raise funds for programs for welfare and relief versus "leadership development," which was relegated to special funding that might come forth from a designated gift and for a limited time.

I believe leadership during those early years was so focused on the agencies and overseas that the idea of spending money on something that could not be quantified was beyond their grasp or what they saw as their fiduciary responsibility. They did not see the benefit of community development of human resources, and I believe we lost a great opportunity for being ahead of the curve in reaching out in that way to Jews in our community and being more inclusive.

The Women's Division was very aggressive in its programming and campaign development, and the plus giving grew both in amount and also levels. From a dollar a day saved in a shoe box, to estate planning and investment strategy for single and married women, to creating awareness of giving opportunity and capability that might have not been brought to their attention. This continues and in a more and more sophisticated manner through today.

I do believe that our Federation has worked hard to try to be more and more creative and has not stood still in its growth in response to service needs of its population. This is evidenced by the formation of the JVSAs and its rapid growth in the early seventies, of Menorah Park, of the overseas committee, and our significant role in catching the attention of the national community in calling the question on the credibility of the Jewish Agency's structure, process, and overseas allocations.

One of the main things that has kept my interest in our Federation is that I have always had the sense that we want to do the right thing, and that we were willing to be the leaders with new and innovative ideas that could have a larger benefit in encouraging giving. The only area that we continued to falter, to be hesitant, was to the major commitment of ongoing community development, which would not show a dollar return for several years down the road, but could build confidence and involvement in this and next generations, and position the Federation as a much more "caring" institution.

I think there might have been an underlying feeling that we were not meant to be touchy-feely and that we should stay focused on our mission, which was to raise money. It was the attitude that began to be challenged in the late eighties and nineties with a younger generation that did not have the emotional charge of memory of the establishment of the State of Israel, let alone a first generation attachment to World War II and the Holocaust. They were not part of this era, and they had other things on their mind and many more opportunities for giving in their fields of interest with direct experience and benefit. Israel was not necessarily high on their list. Nor did they feel a direct responsibility for keeping the local agencies strong. In many cases, their parents were taking care of that, or they were just unaware and uneducated in this area. Community development had not reached them in time.

The Federation moved into its new building in 1984, and this was a new beginning in several ways. First of all in visibility to the general public: a building in a downtown area with signs on the street level, encouraging agencies to have their offices in the building affording closer communication and interaction, a museum that acknowledged the role of culture in the health and quality of Jewish

life and serving as well as a bridge for reaching out to the general community, creating a sense of place and a central address in the city.

The eighties were a real growth period for the Federation, and it was exciting to be part of it. I felt very positive about what I was doing and the story to be told, and the commitment to be made of time, energy, and resources. It was great to share that. The establishment of the overseas committee was for me a recognition of what I saw as a real opportunity for community participation. A chance to have hands-on relationships with individual Israelis who were willing to volunteer their time and insight for both Israel's benefit and our community's benefit. Real people, rather than agencies or institutions, with whom we could have a dialogue and create ongoing friendships and relationships. What a concept!! It made you more passionate about what you were doing and much more sensitive to what the Israelis were dealing with. The difficulties in creating communal services and networks in villages and neighborhoods where all of this could be and usually was foreign. It was a plus for community development and hands-on participation that was definitely responding to my desire to have more of this programming in place here and overseas.

I think that much of this breakthrough was due to Brian's blueskying mentality, and his pushing all of us to see beyond the edge of the envelope, to keep seeking more and more openness and accountability as well.

The Women's Division had in the meantime taken its solid position in the Federation structure and continued to be gung ho in its mission. I remember well a great sense of loss and trepidation when our much older leadership retired or passed on, and the realization that I along with other colleagues were moving into senior positions and making decisions that could affect the community at least in the next generation.

The first demographic study showed a lot of disaffected Jews in the community, and their lack of awareness of the work of the Federation. Many saw the Federation as an elitist group--not a good image. The strategic plan that encouraged community development as a priority of the Federation was an exciting development, though when it came to funding a staff position etc., it always appeared vulnerable to staff reduction. I began to ask about the possibility of the role of the endowment as an enabler of critical Federation functions, i.e., a department of community development. However, I did not get support for my inquiry, and to this day I feel the leadership at the time was not visionary or willing to go to their board or supporters to encourage that kind of funding. I believe they felt that was not the role of the endowment, and their contributors would not support the idea of that type of collaboration. Obviously, I did not agree with that thinking, and in fact I was annoyed at what I felt was overprotectiveness of a

group of contributors, many of whom had not been part of the Federation process. And here was an opportunity for responding to a real need and involving them more directly: education, education, education. It finally became a department in 1990.

Our community was continuing to be challenged in major ways, particularly with the resettlement of Russian Jewry, the financial commitment that was being requested across our nation, and the rescue and resettlement of the Ethiopian Jews. I was always very proud that we stood tall in our response. We are a leadership community and do effect change.

Ninety ninety-one was a banner year for community development, particularly when we pulled off Shalom 91. We were not deterred by the Gulf War, which was ongoing as we were recruiting people for this mega mission. Dick and I co-chaired it and were excited by the challenge and the way it was being marketed and structured. Though we had hoped to have around five hundred people, we were elated that approximately 300-350 did come along, and it was, I believe, a memorable time for all. It was also the only mega mission mounted in San Francisco, which makes it even more memorable. We believe that having fields of interest that reached beyond the traditional categories was original and a breath of fresh air. From politics to art, to health and welfare, to you name it, you could be in a bus that added that to its basic itinerary, and we had people from so many different "streams." It proved again the importance of missions, of getting people to Israel and a first-hand experience, of showing off Federation as caring for personal as well as public needs.

I began my presidency with a new executive director, and though I knew I would miss the highflying vision of Brian, I was comfortable about working with Wayne. He was, and is today, a much more conservative executive and is very sensitive to the thinking and concerns of his major donors. Wayne was not a high-risk taker and, I am sure, committed to providing an atmosphere of stability and high maintenance that would reap the best dollar return. His inward thinking came at an appropriate time because of a need and desire to pull in on administrative costs and redeploying of staff, etc., and addressing an accumulated deficit in general operating funds of \$1.5 million. It came on my watch to deal with how best to address this deficit, whether it was appropriate to carry it or begin to pay it down, without affecting the infrastructure of the Federation and its ability in an already strained staff core to do its job and to continue to offer an appropriate response to the needs of our donors and our recipients. How could we maintain and strengthen our leadership position amongst our peer community, respond to the question of our unaffiliated constituency, nurture and encourage their participation in the Federation's mission, offer them access responding to their interests and comfort level, run a strong and sophisticated campaign using innovative technology and ideas, keep excellent and experienced staff,

let alone a strong volunteer leadership team, while exercising a fiduciary responsibility that might make us more bare bones and bottom line attractive on the expense side, but would run the risk of coming up short on the income side, with an increasingly discomfited and weakened contributor base. This could be the time to spend more money to do the marketing that would show the Federation as a modern institution, one that understands its clients and can respond to its questions and concerns and provide solutions to its low prioritizing of Federation's work.

At the same time that this was being addressed, our community was asked to participate in the sinking fund to cover the possible indemnification of the Council of Jewish Federation's loan guarantee program, which we did and in the long run was not drawn upon. Discussions took place with the endowment leadership to have a further discussion about its relationship with the Federation and its administrative operation and program needs, just where the opportunities for links were, and looking to changing the we/they attitude that had developed between the two entities. Just what was the opportunity for the endowment to play a productive role in furthering the success of the Federation, particularly with the increasing awareness that our community had to do something dramatic and immediate to encourage new contributors; particularly to bring in the next generation who did not find the Federation attractive in the myriad of the fields where they would like to give their time and money. We had to offer them something of value, something that would be of benefit to them in exchange for their financial and volunteer involvement. We were losing them.

My two years of presidency prioritized trying to find new ways to involve groups of Jews who felt isolated, real or imagined, from the Federation system, i.e., rabbis, synagogue members, agency volunteers, new emigres, and young business and professional men and women. I do not believe the Federation did itself any good by hammering away at its being the central address for the Jewish community. It annoyed the rabbis and synagogues and was arrogant in its assumption as an all-consuming service organization. It could have been a lot more diplomatic and sensitive to the fact that the synagogues themselves were having similar membership problems and needed moral and other support, and that they provided the soul and offered the historical, cultural, and ethical enrichment to our community that the Federation then complemented as the umbrella for providing services. We initiated task forces and focus groups to have dialogue with synagogues, agencies, rabbis, new leadership, etc., all with the idea of understanding our community needs. Listening and gathering information with the promise of taking action on the priorities identified.

We had excellent staff and volunteer leadership and commitment, and we also had the attention of the endowment to assist with grants for implementation. We tried to be as participatory as possible and make

old and new timers feel that their input was valuable and beneficial. We initiated quarterly agency luncheon gatherings so that they could report to each other on what was happening within their arenas, an unusual and much welcomed activity. My presidency focused on nurturing and creating bridges of understanding and cooperation that hopefully would build on a future stronger relationship and return in the future. Our campaigns were steady, not growing dramatically, and reflecting the mood of the day, which was questioning our allocation overseas, concern for our local agencies and concern for the credibility of the allocation process of the Jewish Agency itself.

We discovered an accounting problem that showed a \$600 thousand shortfall for which Wayne had to be responsive and find ways to bring it back. There were more discussions with the endowment and the sharing of administrative expenses, retrenchment, cutting back of staff, which pushed us further and further away from being able to move out with a strong marketing appeal, though our mailings, graphics, and brochures were certainly improving visually.

Running parallel with this was the oversight of the UJCC/JCC and their fiscal disaster, which was a major topic of discussion, and which was not a winning situation. A lot of volunteer effort, staff time and money, and difficult and confusing decision-making kept this problem going without good results through the last part of the nineties. It was not our finest hour as a community. The push/pull mentality, the lack of strong conviction of leadership made this a difficult time financially, emotionally, and administratively. Though we saw the great success of the Osher/Marin JCC, there was not the same momentum for the San Francisco JCC. Instead there was mistrust, annoyance, and disgust at the mess being perpetuated there, and a growing interest to give up. In the end, greater oversight by an interested committee was recommended. Today there is a renewed vision for the JCC and its role in San Francisco and great leadership by the executive director, Nate Levine, who came back in the Federation family after a successful stint at Stanford in the major gifts department.

I left my presidency with the hope that some of the new initiatives that had been started in community development would be carried forward by the next president and by the endowment. If they faltered or were shelved, considering the hands on nature of my two years and the effort put forth by so many people for a new window of opportunity, it would have shown the Federation as not being really serious in its intent and so slow moving on change that in some cases some of out network communities (Peninsula) might seriously want to pull out and go at dealing with their own constituency on their own. This, by the way, had been a rumble during the early nineties that forced the issue of regionalization and more control over allocation in their particular neighborhoods.

I went off to Washington immediately after turning over the presidency to Doug Heller and did not have the chance to move into the post leadership roles traditionally available to past presidents. Being out for three and a half years reduced the possibility of a postmortem on my administration and my contribution. I know that I was very, very proud to serve, felt good about the interaction with my peers, learned a lot about myself, my requirements, my expectations, and the requirements and expectations of others. That things take time, time, time, that what might be forgivable by contributors to secular institutions is not necessarily so in Jewish philanthropy. The Federation is held much more accountable on all levels than general institutions, and in many instances without the opportunity to respond.

I will always be grateful for the education that I had through my work at the Federation, and the tools it provided me that I have used in so many other instances: in business, in family life, and in other volunteer work. As well the opportunity to be able to tell the story of the Federation to the broader community was very special to me and to emphasize the extraordinary responsibility that the Jewish community has year after year to take care of each other as we also participate improving the quality of life in the general community.

I only wish that my children had come hand in hand along with me in my interest and commitment. They didn't, and do not feel the same obligation to do so with any urgency. They have other areas of interest that attract them more, and which their friends are also attracted to. I do not stress over it anymore, though I feel the loss of sharing in the caring and understanding and the lost opportunity to meet some outstanding professionals and volunteers. My satisfaction is only that they are proud of their Judaism, good citizens, and respond to direct requests. They are also doing some very good things on their own that add to the quality of life in our society. I am very proud of them for that.

ROSELYNE CHROMAN SWIG

Office:

Roselyne C. Swig, President, ComCon, Intl.
 244 Kearny Street, 4th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 phone: (415) 956-3222
 fax: (415) 956-1062
 e-mail: sfoffice@comconintl.com

Home:

3710 Washington Street
 San Francisco, CA 94118
 phone: (415) 752-2122
 fax: (415) 387-8525

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

The Swig Company, San Francisco, CA. *Member, Board of Directors*, 1998-. Member Finance & Budget committee; Member ad hoc committee.

Roselyne C. Swig, ComCon Intl., San Francisco, CA. *Founder and President, Community Consultant*, 1997-. Consulting with individuals, institutions and agencies on work product, development and collaboration.

United States Department of State, Art in Embassies Program, Washington DC. By Presidential Appointment. *Director*, 1994-1997. Directed program which assembles loaned works of American art displayed in 176 United States embassy residences worldwide.

Roselyne C. Swig Artsource, San Francisco, CA. *Founder and President*, 1977-1994. Fine art consulting company to individuals, corporations, and municipalities.

EDUCATION

University of California, Los Angeles.
 University of California, Berkeley.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES – CURRENT

Mills College, Oakland, CA. *Trustee*, 1987-1996, 1999-.

National Public Radio Foundation, Washington, D.C. *Trustee*, 1999-.

American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), Washington, D.C. *National Vice President* 1987-1994; 1998-.

University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, Berkeley, CA. *Founding President, Board of Trustees*, 1982-1984. *Campaign Chairman*, 1980-1982. *Member, Board of Trustees*, 1982-.

Brandeis University, International Research Institute on Jewish Women, Waltham, MA. *Member, Board of Directors*, 1997-.

National Gallery of Art. *Member, Collector's Committee*, 1997-.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. *National Board Member*, 1990 *Chairman, Former Soviet Union Committee*, 1995-1997. *Treasurer and Chairman, Finance and Budget Committee*, 1997-98.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES - CURRENT (continued)

Women's Forum West. *Member, 1990-; Board Member 1999-.*

International Women's Forum. *Member, 1990-.*

San Francisco Partners Ending Domestic Abuse. *Founder, Member of the Board 1992-.*

Tel-Aviv Museum of Art, Israel. *International Board of Governors, 1991-.*

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. *Member, Board of Trustees, 1985-. Chairman, Phase II \$90 Million Capital Campaign for the New Museum, 1990-1992.*

Jewish Museum of San Francisco, *Member, Board of Directors, 1984-.*

Federal Reserve System Board of Governors. *Vice Chairman, 1995. Member, Fine Arts Advisory Panel, 1977-1984; 1988-.*

Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, The Peninsula, Marin, and Sonoma Counties. *President, Board of Directors, 1992-1994. Campaign Chairman, 1984. President, Women's Division, 1974-1978. Member, Board of Directors, 1974-.*

San Francisco Art Institute. *Trustee-at-Large, 1998-. Chairman, Board of Trustees, 1972-1976. Member, Board of Trustees, 1968-1978. Selection Committee to Seek New President, 1973-1974. Chairman, Women's Board, 1964-1969. Member, Women's Board, 1964-1972.*

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES - PAST

University of California, Berkeley Foundation. *By Chancellor Appointment. Trustee, 1981-1988.*

San Francisco Arts Commission. *President, 1982-1986. Mayoral Appointment and re-appointment, 1976-1988.*

Mayor Dianne Feinstein's Committee for a Memorial to the Six Million Victims of the Holocaust. *By Mayoral Appointment. Chairman, Design Committee, 1981-1984.*

San Francisco Public Library Commission. *Mayoral Appointment, 1989-1992.*

San Francisco Cultural Affairs Task Force. *Appointed by San Francisco Board of Supervisors, 1991-1992.*

Women's Campaign Fund (WCF). *Member, Board of Directors, 1992-1994.*

San Francisco Opera Association. *Director, 1973-1995. Member, Finance Committee, 1992.*

State of Israel Bonds. *Associate National Chairman, 1984. General Chairman, Northern California, 1982-1983.*

United Jewish Appeal. *National Board of Directors, 1994-1997.*

Jewish Vocational Services Agency. *Member, Board of Directors, 1973-74; Board President, 1976-78.*

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES - PAST (continued)

Opportunity Capital Corporation. *Board Member, 1975-1979.*

KQED, Inc., Public Broadcasting, San Francisco. Elected by the Members. *Board of Directors, 1986-1992.*

National Endowment for the Arts. By NEA Chairman Appointment. *Local Programs Panel, 1987-1988.*

NORCAL Solid Waste Systems, Inc. *Advisory Board, Artist in Residence Program, 1990.*

Art In Public Places, City of Vail, CO. *Art Panel Board Member, 1989-1992.*

San Francisco Economic Development Corporation. *Board of Directors, 1989-1992.*

California State Summer School for the Arts. *Charter Board Member. Chairman of the Board, 1986-1992.*

American Council for the Arts. *Director, 1981-1992.*

HONORS

Wheeler Oak Meritorious Award, December 1999. University of California, UC Berkeley Foundation.

Community Service Award, 1999. Woman's Campaign Fund.

Annual Gala Honoree (Illumination Fund), 1998. San Francisco Art Institute.

First Annual Roselyne C. Swig Award, June 1997. Partners Ending Domestic Abuse.

Frank Brennan Award, 1995. St. Vincent De Paul Society.

First Annual Chai Award, 1994. Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, The Peninsula, Marin, and Sonoma Counties.

Chamber of Commerce Business Leadership Award, 1991. Business Arts Council of San Francisco.

Civic Commitment Award, 1989. B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League.

Honorary Doctorate of Fine Arts (D.F.A.), 1988. San Francisco Art Institute.

Outstanding Alumnae Community Service Award, 1987. Alpha Epsilon Phi Sorority.

Honorary Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.), 1986. San Francisco Art Institute.

Woman of Valor Award, 1983. State of Israel Bonds.

Myrtle Wreath Award, 1982. Hadassah, Central Pacific Coast Region.

Advocates for Women Honoree, 1981. Annual "Moving Up" Luncheon.

American Benefactor Magazine, Philanthropic Leader.

PAST SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

The Century Club of California Speakers Program. *An In-Depth View Of The Placement of Art in American Ambassadors' Embassies*, December 3, 1997. San Francisco, CA.

The Commonwealth Club of California, Arts Speakers Program. *Art in Embassies and How It Is Chosen*, September 23, 1997. San Francisco, CA.

Women's Forum West, - Art in Embassies Program, 1994

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. *The Story of 'The Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State,'* April 1997.

United States Embassy, Brunei. *The Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State*, October 1996.

United States Embassy, Fiji. *The Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State*, October 1996.

United States Embassy, The Philippines. *The Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State*, October 1996.

United States Embassy, Cambodia. *The Art in Embassies Program of the U.S. Department of State*, October 1996.

St. Vincent de Paul Society, 1995 Frank Brennan Award Dinner. *Raising the Awareness Level on the Issue of Domestic Violence*, March 29, 1995. San Francisco, CA.

Mills College Women's Leadership Institute Lecture Series. *Leadership: Personal, Private, Public and Professional*, March 2, 1994. Oakland, CA.

Jewish Community Federation Speaker's Bureau. *Priorities in the Business and Volunteer Communities*, February 17, 1994. San Diego, CA. *The Art of Giving*, November 30, 1993. San Francisco, CA.

Partners Ending Domestic Abuse, 1993 Benefit Event. Keynote Address, April 22, 1993. San Francisco, CA.

National Conference: "Courts and Communities: Confronting Violence in the Family." Invited Speaker, March 25, 1993. San Francisco, CA.

Junior League of San Francisco. *Leadership and the Year of the Woman: Implications, Obligations and Opportunities*, October 21, 1992. San Francisco, CA.

Business Arts Council. *The Art of Management and the Main Issues in Serving in a Non-Profit Arts Organization*, June 1991. San Francisco, CA.

International Diplomacy Council Art in the Embassies Program, October 1998

New Leadership Project. Panelist on leadership, November 1998

Speaker at numerous conferences on philanthropy.

Women's Division



JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION OF SAN FRANCISCO - MARIN COUNTY AND THE PENINSULA

122

August 15, 1969

TO : Board of Directors
FROM: Mrs. Richard L. Swig, President

As you know, the first meeting of the new Board of Directors of the Women's Division will be held on Thursday, September 11, at 10 A.M., at my home, 45 McLaren Avenue, San Francisco.

The agenda for the meeting will include presentation of plans made during the summer months by the Executive, Campaign, and Education Committees for the coming year's activities. We will also have present the heads of the Federation's Campaign, Public Relations, and Social Planning departments who will help us to become better acquainted with their departments' responsibilities.

Since this will be the kickoff for what promises to be a very busy and exciting year for the Women's Division, I know that we will have a full attendance by the Board members. Please return the enclosed reply card to let me know that you will attend.

RS:jg

P.S. May I ask those Board members who have not already completed and returned their Committee Preference slips to the Federation office to do so before the Board Meeting. Would you also remember to bring to the meeting the names of 10 women you know who have never been involved in Women's Division activities.

OFFICERS

Mrs. Richard L. Swig
President

Mrs. Herbert A. Ginsberg
1st Vice President

Mrs. A. Aaron Elkind
Vice President

Mrs. Jay P. Homerslog, Jr.
Vice President

Mrs. Robert A. Mendle
Vice President

Mrs. Franklin M. Battat
Secretary
Seymour Kleid
Staff Advisor

Mrs. Lowell Adelson
Mrs. Julien Bauer
Mrs. Abraham Bernstein*
Mrs. Charles L. Bleadon
Mrs. Julius Bloch
Mrs. Louis Bloch
Mrs. Ben M. Blum
Mrs. Sheldon G. Cable
Mrs. A. Louis Cohen
Mrs. William S. Corvin
Mrs. Morris M. Culiner
Mrs. Lloyd W. Dinkelspiel, Jr.
Mrs. George Edelstein
Mrs. Warren G. Epstein

DIRECTORS

Mrs. Jack M. Feder, Jr.
Mrs. Alvin I. Fine
Mrs. Stanley M. Friedman
Mrs. Richard N. Goldman
Mrs. Gilbert P. Gradinger
Mrs. Morris A. Green
Mrs. Richard M. Greenberg
Mrs. Richard Harris
Mrs. Irving I. Hausman
Mrs. Jules M. Heumann
Mrs. Marvin S. Iscoff
Mrs. Harry Jacobs
Mrs. Margery Knox*
Mrs. Vernon N. Lambertson

CONSTITUENT AGENCY AUXILIARY REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. Bruce K. Denebeim
Homewood Terrace

Mrs. Yale H. Smulyan
Jewish Home
for the Aged

Mrs. Byron J. Samuel
Mount Zion Hospital

Mrs. Ben Dorfman
United Jewish
Community Centers

*Ex-Officio

WOMEN'S DIVISION

PRESIDENTS

1957 - 1959

Mrs. Edgar N. Goldstine

1965 - 1967

Mrs. William H. Green

1959 - 1961

Mrs. Robert Levison

1967 - 1969

Mrs. Abraham Bernstein

1961 - 1963

Mrs. Harold J. Kaufman

1969 - 1971

Mrs. Richard L. Swig

1963 - 1965

Mrs. Joseph Blumlein

1971 -

Mrs. A. Aaron Elkind

CAMPAIGN CHAIRMEN

1948

Mrs. Morris Gallas

1957

Mrs. Daniel Stone

*Mrs. Jessie Colman

1958

*Mrs. Stanley Levin

1949

Mrs. Edgar N. Goldstine

1959-1960

Mrs. James Schwabacher

Mrs. Vernon Lambertsen

1950

Mrs. Arthur Barnett

1961

Mrs. Robert L. Goldman

Mrs. Joseph Blumlein

1951

Miss Katherine Simon

1962

Mrs. Reuben Rinder

Mrs. Simon Anixter

1952

Mrs. Louis Honig, Sr.

1963-1964

Mrs. Mathew O. Tobriner

Mrs. William H. Green

1953

Mrs. John C. Altman

1965-1966

Mrs. Herbert I. Ross

Mrs. Abraham Bernstein

1954

Mrs. Robert M. Levison

1967

Mrs. Richard L. Swig

1955

Mrs. Paul Levinson

1968-1969

Mrs. Ernest Rogers

1956

Mrs. Ernest Lilienthal

Mrs. Margery Knox

1970-1971

Mrs. Herbert A. Ginsberg

1972

Mrs. Harold S. Dobbs

SF CHRONICLE
6/22/72

Social Scene

By Virginia Westover

A Kennedy in Town

Tokyo (they left yesterday morning). Taking a table together were the William Turnbulls, the Sam Esterkyns, the Dimitri Bartons, the Harvey Glassers and the David Rabins.

* * *

X FOR THE first time in its 101-year history, the board of trustees at the San Francisco Art Institute has named a woman as its chairman.

Mrs. Richard (Cissie) Swig was named to that post Tuesday. Cissie, who has been on the institute's board since 1966 and on the women's board for "about a dozen years, I think," adds this post to a growing roster of civic activities.

J She's on the boards of both the San Francisco Opera Guild and Opera Association, and is the local liaison for the Foreign Diplomat Travel Program, a privately funded program. Cissie is also (this is a long one) regional vice chairman of the National Women's Communal Services of the Council of Jewish Welfare Federation and Welfare Funds—and is on the national women's board of United Jewish Appeal.

Her husband is president of the Fairmont Hotel Company. They have three children: Rick, 21; Marjorie, 16; and Carol, 13.

* * *

X THE 20-YEAR marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Jurek Byczkowski ended this week when Kathleen (Nini) Byczkowski filed for dissolution of marriage in San Francisco Superior Court. They've been separated since earlier this year. The Byczkowskis have three children: Peter, 19; Anne, 14; and Leila, 7.



REPORT ON STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN

Reviewed by Implementation Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, January, 1992
Presented to JCF Board of Directors, March, 1992

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Original Goals

Create a Department of Community Development to increase involvement in the Jewish community; convene other Jewish organizations and serve as coordinator and facilitator for community development activities.

Develop a "Fund for the Future" to provide ongoing funding for community development activities in the federation and the rest of the community.

Establish regional structures tied to the central structure to provide a mechanism for intra- and interagency coordination.

Accomplishments

The Department of Community Development was created in October 1990 with six functions, five of which have been activated:

Volunteer Placement Project - Helps place people in volunteer positions in Jewish organizations. Ten volunteer intake interviewers have conducted over 70 face-to-face interviews with potential volunteers.

Council on Interfaith Couples - Consortium of organizations providing services to interfaith couples and families. The Council has developed an "ideal model plan" for the community and has begun publishing a quarterly newsletter, *BRIDGES: Issues and Information for Interfaith Couples*.

Commission on Outreach/Follow-Up - Concentrated on participants in the Shalom '91 mega-mission to Israel. Various follow-up programs were held. A one-year evaluation report is being drafted.

Jewish Community Information & Referral - Already in existence five years. JCI&R has answered over 15,000 calls. Currently has 10 volunteers.

Commission on Ad Hoc Activities - The Dept. of Community Development currently sponsors six JCF Study Groups. It plays an instrumental role in other community co-sponsored events such as Newcomers Fairs, Hebrew-in-a-Day, Sepharad '92, and the 1992 Jewish Women's Conference.

Still to be Done - DELEGATED TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. *Synagogue Council* - While relations with some synagogues and the Community Development Department are strong, there are still synagogues without formal ties to the JCF apart from funding through the Bureau of Jewish Education.

March, 1992

Page 2

2. *Fund for the Future* - With the urgency of Operation Exodus, the development of the Fund for the Future was put on hold. However, it is clear that various projects such as the Newcomers Fairs would benefit from allocations from such a fund. At present, a proposal to establish a FUND FOR JEWISH LIFE is being considered.
3. *Staffing/Relationship with the Campaign/Regions* - This may be the trickiest area to resolve. The Department of Community Development has two full-time professional staff and one part-time support position. There is a demonstrated need to increase the support position to full-time. There is also a need to create structural ties between the regional community development activities and the central department. At present, the campaign department has several positions that have primarily community development responsibilities. If possible, these positions should become more strongly connected with the Community Development Department. The question of how to implement this remains to be resolved.

PLANNING AND ALLOCATIONS

Regional Goals

Integrate ongoing planning into the allocations process with continued input from regional and agency leadership and staff.

Target JCF allocations to fund community priorities.

Create a more effective allocations process in order to fulfill federation's fiduciary responsibility.

Accomplishments

Planning has been brought more into the process through interagency coordinating committees which meet regularly to coordinate services and provide ongoing input into the priority-setting process. In addition, most regions hold interagency meetings on a regular basis to address the specific concerns of the local community, with respect to services and priorities for future funding.

Allocations are now made by service area. Agencies are no longer given automatic cost-of-living increases across the board. Recommendations for determining community priorities also now come from a variety of sources, including the Strategic Plan, agency service providers, and regional councils, along with input from the different allocations committees.

The P&A committee structure has been redesigned according to service areas, not by groupings of agencies, and the process includes more interagency planning committees. In addition, the P&A Dept. can help garner resources from outside the federation, such as the Koret Foundation, United Way, and the Federal government. For example, after the earthquake, the P&A Dept. helped many of the agencies secure Federal funds through FEMA.

Still to be Done - DELEGATED TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ALLOCATIONS

1. *More focused discussion on needs assessment and long-range planning.*

2. *Greater accountability from agencies regarding their budgets and their use of federation and other funds.*

3. *Increased consultations with agencies to help them resolve problems such as budget reconciliation, management, and personnel.*

4. *Securing of additional dollars outside the campaign to assist the community, such as with emigre resettlement funds and earthquake relief.*

5. *More staff to expand the interagency coordinating committees and the allocations committees so that they can continue in the direction of focusing on service areas and priorities instead of on individual agencies.*

FINANCIAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Original Goals

1. *Raise more money in the short term through an increased focus on \$5,000+ donors, and through developing a Designated Giving program.*
2. *Cultivate new and upcoming donors through utilizing staff as "Account Executives," approaching the donor "holistically," increasing endowment and capital gifts, and increasing donor research.*
3. *Broaden the base through a centralized "Community Campaign." coordinate with agency fundraising and expand corporate matching gifts programs.*
4. *Incorporate community building as a major function of the federation by separating FRD and CD staff functions.*

Accomplishments

- *Increased focus on \$5,000+ Gifts for Operation Exodus* - This level was used as a public benchmark and seems to have been quite successful.
- *Initial testing of "Account Executives" and utilizing a holistic approach to donors* - The transformation of campaign staff into account executives for total resource development proved to be more difficult than anticipated, especially with higher-end donors, because there is debate regarding the role of professionals in upper-level solicitations.
- *Increased donor research* - In the 1992 campaign a new volunteer position has been created to research new \$5,000+ gifts.
- *The Community Campaign consolidation of under-\$500 gifts* - Implemented in the 1990 campaign. All under-\$500 gifts are solicited either by mail appeal or telemarketing. Greatest percentage increase of all divisions - in 1991 had an increase of 28% compared to 4% overall for the Annual Campaign.
- *Integration of Community Development into campaign activities* - The Young Leadership Council serves as a clearinghouse for a dozen federation groups, many of which are new and on a regional level.

Still to be Done - RECOMMENDED THAT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEE BE REVITALIZED AS THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES

1. *Total Financial Resources Development/Alternative Vehicles for Giving* - The federation has not integrated campaign and endowment in terms of fundraising or allocations. Because of this, it is nearly impossible to approach any donor "holistically."
2. *Designated Giving* - Efforts to develop a Designated Giving program were halted due to Operation Exodus, which in itself could be considered the greatest opportunity for designated giving.
3. *Separation of Staff Functions (FRD vs. CD)* - Most of the campaign staff still dedicate their time to both financial resources development tasks and community development tasks. Those on campaign staff who do have primarily CD positions should be considered part of the Dept. of CD.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS/COMPUTER

Original Goals

Search and obtain a new computer system to handle the increasing demands of the federation in the areas of fundraising (second-line campaign) and community development (tracking of volunteerism and involvement).

Accomplishments

General requirements were documented for four departments: Campaign, Community Development, Endowment and Accounting.

Staff attended several demonstrations of systems.

A list has been compiled of systems (hardware and software) and contacts for other federations and other non-profit organizations.

Still to be Done - DELEGATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Draft a comprehensive report - include detailed definitions requirements and volume analysis.

Identify vendors and issue a Request For Proposal.

Select vendor and hardware.

Secure funding from the Finance Committee.

GOVERNANCE

Original Goal

Design a system of governance that would allow the Board of Directors to delve more deeply into substantive issues of vision, planning and policy, spend less time managing the day-to-day activities of the federation, and provide regional representation in the decision-making process of the federation.

Accomplishments

Subcommittee on Governance drafted a one-year experiment for the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee. The model would accomplish the following:

The Board of Directors would meet for an annual retreat and every other month for a three-hour meeting to address specific issues of relevance to the vision, policy and planning of the federation and the Jewish community.

The Executive Committee would meet monthly and be empowered by the Board of Directors to handle the day-to-day tasks of running the federation.

The Executive Committee would be expanded to include seats specifically for representatives chosen by each region.

Still to be Done - TO BE RECONSIDERED AND IMPLEMENTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, WITH THE RECOMMENDATION TO REVIEW THE MEETING SCHEDULE AND TIMES

Implement the model, which was approved by the JCF Board of Directors and then put on hold for one year until the new executive was comfortably in place.

REGIONALIZATION

Original Goals

This area has been perhaps the most vague to implement, because there were very few specific recommendations. The ideas of regional empowerment and bringing services and programs to where the people are surfaced in most committees' discussions, but the concepts were not operationalized.

The few recommendations that were clearly identified are:

1. *Create regional governing bodies to coordinate local agency services, implement community priorities and focus on local CD activities.*
2. *Improve local communications and marketing through local newsletters.*
3. *Ensure regional representation in the federation's decision-making process (see section on Governance).*

Accomplishments

- *Regional Councils* - Some sort of regional coordinating body exists in all regions except San Francisco. In the South Peninsula, a block grant and regional board experiment has been underway for several years. The North Peninsula Conference has been disbanded, but the professionals meet on a regular basis, and the formation of a new Regional Council is being discussed. In Sonoma, the Regional Council discusses planning issues, exchanges program information, and sponsors outreach programs; it has no allocations or governing functions. In Marin, the Strategic Planning Human Services Committee has continued as the planning arm of the local community, with no governance functions at all. In San Francisco, where it is the most difficult to foster a sense of regional identity, the staff from the various federation groups have begun meeting on a regular basis.
- *Newsletters* now exist in Sonoma, Marin and the South Peninsula. Written by regional staff, they cover local interest stories and calendars.
- *Governance* - The experimental one-year model builds in seats on the Executive Committee for regional representatives. In addition, the Planning & Allocations Steering Committee has seats for regional representatives.

Still to be Done

1. *Continue fostering of sense of Jewish Community at the regional level.* Coordination of centralized and decentralized community development efforts. - DELEGATED TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.
2. *Evaluation of South Peninsula experiment.* - DELEGATED TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ALLOCATIONS.

San Francisco Examiner, September 13,
1992



MY STYLE

CISSIE SWIG IN CONVERSATION WITH MANDY BEHBEHANI

ROSELYNE SWIG, universally known as "Cissie," is a member of one of San Francisco's most influential clans. Along with families such as

the Shorensteins, the Gettys and the Haases, the Swigs, part-owners of the Fairmont hotels, are among the people who make this town hum.

Cissie, a gentle, understated, articulate and elegant woman, and her husband, Dick, are heavily involved with the Democratic Party and have been major supporters of the Bill Clinton/Al Gore ticket. Gore thanked Cissie Swig in a televised address to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee during the Democratic convention.

Swig's influence and activities extend beyond traditional society/philanthropic boundaries.

She recently helped form a new group, Partners Ending Domestic Abuse, at the request of the Liz Claiborne company, which started a monthlong billboard campaign in San Francisco last week to raise public awareness about domestic abuse. Other local leaders include Mayor Jordan, Senate candidate Dianne Feinstein,

Wenny Kusuma, co-chair of the S.F. Domestic Violence Consortium, Kevin Shelley, president of the S.F. Board of Supervisors, Caryl Ito of the Commission on the Status of Women, and artists Margaret Crane, Jon Winkel, Diane Tani and Carrie Mae Weems.

An avid collector who owns the S.F. consulting firm Artsource, Swig also headed the second phase of the New Museum Campaign Committee to raise corporate gifts for the new Museum of Modern Art.

We sat down with Cissie Swig in her sunny, airy, downtown Artsource offices on Belden Place that are filled with beautiful modern art — paintings by Julian Schnabel and Sean Scully, a sculpture by Richard Hudson.

Dressed in a red silk printed Adolfo dress (she likes him, despite Nancy Reagan), Swig talked of politics, art and the changing face of San Francisco.

MANDY BEHBEHANI: Tell me about Partners Ending Domestic Abuse.

CISSIE SWIG: It's part of the public awareness campaign that the Liz Claiborne company's doing, a major photographic exhibit on bus shelters and billboards throughout San Francisco. The company commissioned five fine artists to go into shelters and interview and photograph battered women and batterers. Our company, Artsource, was asked to be involved because we are socially conscious.

We took members of the San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium to funders, educating them on the pervasiveness of this issue. We were very grass-roots about this and slowly but surely, there was a lot of interest.

The photographers and artists are all wonderful. One is (Magnum) photojournalist Susan Meiselas, who won a MacArthur Foundation "genius" award.

We see this as a public/private partnership. See MY STYLE (page 24).

◆ *MY STYLE from D-1*

My Style with Cissie Swig

nership. The City has done its part. In the budget, it has set \$300,000 for increased services. Now the private sector must do its part. My own two daughters are involved in this. It's not something you can really back away from. It affects everybody, especially the children.

MB: Let's talk about the issues facing San Francisco. When Mayor Jordan was elected, many people seemed to think we'd have a new climate in which problems could be solved and business would be welcome. Things aren't working out that way. The homeless are still everywhere, our budget is a mess and now we might be losing the Giants.

CS: It's too early to tell about Frank. There's been a lot of criti-

cism of his role thus far, but it depends on what (situation) you step into. Certainly you need advisers and you need to be able to communicate your vision of the city. Here, because of the economic situation and the education crisis, you hit the ground running and the elected official doesn't necessarily have a honeymoon period.

On the other hand, obviously after a while his administration has to show results. But nine months is not such a long time. And we have much at stake here. We have a city that has a tremendous interwoven fabric. Frank is just one man.

MB: Why can't we come up with creative solutions like New York, where Felix Rohatyn sat down with the business community and the unions at the time of their fiscal crisis, to figure out ways to get through it?

CS: There are some areas where

we're working. We're going to have a new library, a new museum. The Gap is building its headquarters here. These are major institutions and that's going to be good for the city. The projects will put people to work, they'll stand for what San Francisco stands for.

MB: Whom do you blame for the impending loss of the Giants? Can they be saved? How?

CS: My observation is that from the start we had a problem, and that was Candlestick. It's not a park that's appealing for baseball play because of the weather, and to some degree, the distance.

There were ways to solve it in the beginning. They had the opportunity to build another park. Then the Giants had the opportunity to go to San Jose and I think that city made a big mistake not going for it. The team would have anchored their city. San Francisco hesitated when we should have moved forward, and now I think

the opportunity is gone. Because now we have issues that are so difficult that to look for funds to build a stadium seems ... and where?

MB: What will the impact be if they leave?

CS: There's certainly going to be some economic impact. But even though sports are given the highest profile, it is the cultural institutions that always bring in more to the City.

MB: Does the new site for the S.F. Museum of Modern Art and the Yerba Buena Cultural Center under construction bespeak a cultural resurgence?

CS: We are a very strong arts city. Our Symphony, Opera, Ballet, are all world class. SFMOMA was very important before and it will be even more so now. The Fine Arts Museums are expanding and the types of shows they get are incredible. Then there's the S.F. Art Institute. It's the whole gamut, plus we

have very strong smaller museums like the Folk Art Museum, the Mexican Museum and the Jewish Museum.

MB: If the Giants leave, how do we compensate for the loss of prestige?

CS: The Giants and San Francisco have gone hand in hand, but the reality is that people have short memories, and just as when the Giants left New York to come here, New York went on. So will we.

MB: Why did you start Artsource?

CS: I've been involved in actually supporting the arts since the late '50s. And I became involved with the art world here originally through the S.F. Art Institute, which is vibrant, cutting-edge and willing to take risks.

I found out, however, that support for the contemporary arts was not at the level it should be in this town, both in word and deed. There was a great deal of appre-

hension about cutting-edge arts. I was in the late '70s and people didn't quite get it. I decided I could act as an advocate for the arts by bringing art people and prospective customers and artists together. So I started Artsource.

MB: Which artists do you personally like and why?

CS: I like very minimal artists, like the California expressionists, like Ellsworth Kelly, William Wiley, Richard Diebenkorn, Agnes Martin, Jim Dine, Robert Mapplethorpe, Pat Steir and the German artist, Anselm Kiefer. Those are the artists I have at home. We also have a collection of video art that we like very well, including Jim Campbell and Alan Rath, which is a whole new area for us.

MB: Who are your favorite fashion designers? I know you like Galanos.

CS: I like clothes that I feel I'm wearing, rather than them wearing

[See *MY STYLE*, D-6]

◆ *MY STYLE from D-5*

My Style with Cissie Swig

me. The mistakes I've made are clothes that have ended up binding me. I like subtle things. Detail is hard for me because of my size. I like clothes that have very resilient fabric and that travel well. I love Galanos. He's an artist, and the materials he uses are equal to his mastery.

I like Geoffrey Beene. Some of his lines are too extreme for me but he has the same approach. I like practical clothes, something that I can put on and feel good and not have to put on a lot of other things. I also love Mila Schon and Adolfo.

MB: What about casual wear? Do you ever wear jeans?

CS: I'll wear slacks, but not

jeans. I have a hard time with pants.

MB: How do you organize your day?

CS: My day begins at 6 a.m. with a workout at the Nob Hill Club. I'm out of there by 8 and I usually have a breakfast meeting in the Bella Voce in the Fairmont if I can, because it's right there. I have an itinerary and that just takes me through the day. Sometimes I don't have lunch but I do have a lot of luncheon meetings. I usually am home by 6 or 7. What I've learned to do is dress in the morning for the evening . . . which is an interesting feat.

MB: What do you and Dick do to relax?

CS: We have a boat in Sausalito where we spend most of our weekends.

MB: Are Bill Clinton and Al

Gore going to win?

CS: Yes. Looking at four more years of Mr. Bush's administration is not a positive thing for the country. It's time for a change. They bring a freshness and a willingness to talk about what's needed to move this country forward. I'm very excited about this team. It was a brilliant move on Clinton's part to choose Al and wonderful of Al to accept it. They come from different backgrounds but early on they both showed that they were dedicated to public service.

MB: How can Clinton and Gore lose this race?

CS: Through laziness on the part of people in voting, or through a traditional fear of change. The two of them must be honest and strong in their message. They must give people hope and the details behind that hope. It's not enough

to say they're going to change this or that. They have got to show how.

I love the idea that Bill and Al are both the same age because we're in a high-tech age and we're seeing people accomplishing long term goals at an average age of 27, 28, 30. This is key for Clinton and Gore. If they can attract that constituency, then they have a voter-base no one else has had. If they're not successful, if people are lazy or are unwilling to move for change, then maybe what we'll end up with is the status quo. That would be a disaster.

Roselyne C. Swig Report to the JCF Board
Trip to Tashkent and Samarkand, Uzbekistan, FSU
 October, 1993

EXHIBIT I

THE TRIP TO UZBEKISTAN WAS A SUCCESS AND VERY WORTHWHILE, AND I AM VERY HAPPY THAT I WAS ABLE TO GO. THE TRIP GAVE DOUG, WAYNE AND ME A WINDOW INTO A FAR OFF LAND AND CONNECTED US TO JEWS FROM THE ANCIENT JEWISH CULTURE OF BUCHARRA DATING BACK TO THE 3RD CENTURY AND, AS WELL, WITH ASHKENAZI/EUROPEAN JEWS WHO MIGRATED THERE DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR.

THE MESSAGE IS: RESCUE AND SURVIVAL, AND SHOULD BE VIEWED BY THIS AND OTHER COMMUNITIES AS A TOP PRIORITY.

THE BUCHARRAN AND ASHKENAZI JEWISH COMMUNITY HAS SUSTAINED ITS JEWISH RITUAL AND TRADITION AND NOW WE AS A PEOPLE ARE IN A POSITION TO HELP THE ADULTS AND YOUTH RENEW THEIR JEWISH EXPERIENCE AND GIVE THEM A FUTURE THAT WILL BROADEN THEIR HORIZONS AND THEIR JEWISH CONNECTION WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD.

UZBEKISTAN HAS THE LARGEST POPULATION OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE BEING UZBECKS FOLLOWED BY RUSSIANS, KAZACHS AND TAJIKS. INTERESTINGLY ENOUGH, UZBEK NATIONAL IDENTITY DEVELOPED ONLY AFTER THE REPUBLIC WAS ESTABLISHED. CAUGHT BY SURPRISE BY THE DETERIORATION OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT IN MOSCOW, IT HAS HAD TROUBLE COMING TO GRIPS WITH ITS OWN INDEPENDENCE.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC IS ISLAM KARIMOV, A HIGH HANDED LEADER WHO WAS IN POWER BEFORE AND HAS MAINTAINED ALMOST THE SAME GOVERNMENTAL STYLE. HIS CREDIBILITY IS CLOUDED BY CONSISTENT HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, WITH NEWSPAPER CLOSINGS, POLITICAL PERSUASION BEING DENIED THE RIGHT TO VOTE. BY REFUSING TO SIGN A HUMAN RIGHTS ACCORD AT THE MENSHE CIS CONFERENCE, KARIMOV PROJECTS A DARK SIDE TO THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PROVIDING THE REPUBLIC WITH A DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

KARIMOV IS FEARFUL OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MOSLEM FUNDAMENTALISM IN THE SAME WAY HE FEARS LIBERAL DEMOCRACY, AND IT WAS OF GREAT INTEREST TO US THAT DURING OUR TRIP, IRAN'S RASHSENJANI WAS IN TASHKENT AND, AS WELL, WAS VISITING BUCHARRA. IN FACT, THE BUCHARRA AIRPORT, WHICH HAD BEEN CLOSED, WAS OPENED FOR TWO DAYS SO THAT HE COULD GO THERE!

THE ONLY MAJOR REFORM THAT HAS OCCURRED IN UZBEKISTAN IS THE CHANGING OF THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE AND ALPHABET FROM RUSSIAN TO UZBECK, AND THIS IS PLAYING HAVOC WITHIN THE BUSINESS AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

ALONG WITH TAJIKISTAN, UZBEKISTAN HAS THE LOWEST PER CAPITA INCOME IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION. UZBEKISTAN IS A ONE CROP DOMINATED ECONOMY, IN THIS CASE COTTON, AND WITH POLLUTED

FIELDS AND WATERWAYS, IT IS NOW LEFT WITHOUT ANY MAJOR INDUSTRY. IT IS IN URGENT NEED OF INVESTMENT FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURE, FOR MODERN IRRIGATION, WATER PURIFICATION, AND MODERN INDUSTRY. IT HAS RECEIVED LOANS FROM SPAIN, SAUDI ARABIA, AND TURKEY. ITS REQUESTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE HAVE BEEN QUESTIONED BECAUSE OF ITS TERRIBLE RECORD ON HUMAN RIGHTS. UZBEKISTAN DOES NOT HAVE ITS OWN CURRENCY AND IS USING THE RUBLE WHICH IS HIGHLY INFLATED AND WEAKENED BY AN ACTIVE BLACK MARKET.

THE EDUCATION SYSTEM IS A DISASTER AS THE REPUBLIC MOVES TOWARDS NATIONALISM, WITH CLOSE TO 30% OF THE RUSSIAN POPULATION LEAVING THE AREA, AS WELL AS MANY OF THE EUROPEANS. THE DEPARTURE OF THE RUSSIAN ELITE WHO HELD MANY OF THE KEY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IS EVIDENT IN THE ECONOMY, IN THE ADMINISTRATION, AND, IN PARTICULAR, IN EDUCATION. THE WHOLE SCHOOL SYSTEM AT THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEVEL IS BEGINNING TO SHOW SIGNS OF IMMINENT COLLAPSE.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY HAS ALSO DWINDLED. IN 1989 THERE WERE APPROXIMATELY 95,000 JEWS: 60,000 EUROPEAN/ASHKENAZI AND 35,000 BUCHARRANS. TODAY, AFTER THE WAVE OF ALIYAH IN 1989-92, THE JEWISH COMMUNITY NUMBERS AROUND 60,000 AND ARE CONCENTRATED IN THREE AREAS: TASHKENT, 45,000; SAMARKAND, 8,000; AND BUCHARRA, 4,000, THE LATTER TWO PRIMARILY BUCHARRAN JEWS AND THE FORMER PRIMARILY EURO/ASHKENAZI. MOST OF THE EUROPEAN JEWS CAME TO UZBEKISTAN DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND ARE HIGHLY ASSIMILATED AND INTERMARRIED. THE BUCHARRAN JEWS ARE TRADITIONAL AND HAVE ENJOYED A PEACEFUL CO-EXISTANCE WITH THEIR NEIGHBORS. PERHAPS BEING A DISTANCE FROM THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT IN MOSCOW HAS HELPED THE CAUSE. THEY HAVE BEEN IN THE AREA SINCE THE 3RD CENTURY AND HAVE A RICH CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS TRADITION. THEY HAVE SUSTAINED JEWISH THEATER, SYNAGOGUES, CULTURAL CENTERS, SUMMER CAMPS, NOW DUE TO THE DIRECT ASSISTANCE AND OVERSEEING BY THE JEWISH AGENCY, THE JOINT, CHABAD, AND OTHER SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS. HOWEVER, THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT ALLOW THEM TO ISSUE A JEWISH NEWSPAPER.

FROM 1989-92, 45,000 UZBEK JEWS ARRIVED IN ISRAEL, MOSTLY OF EUROPEAN ORIGIN. THE NUMBER OF BUCHARRAN JEWS WAS SMALL UNTIL THE SECOND HALF OF 1992 WHEN THE SITUATION CHANGED, RESULTING IN A MAJOR INCREASE OF BUCHARRAN JEWS TO ISRAEL. ONE THOUSAND JEWS PER MONTH ARE NOW COMING OUT OF UZBEKISTAN ASSISTED BY THE JEWISH AGENCY, THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE, AND THE JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. THE JEWISH AGENCY ENJOYS AN EXCELLENT REPUTATION IN THAT AREA AND HAS BEEN VERY EFFECTIVE WITH SERVICES AND COUNSELING AND OVERALL SUPPORT, AS HAS THE JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. CHABAD IS RUNNING THE AFTER SCHOOL EDUCATION AND PAYING THE SALARIES OF THE TEACHERS, WHILE THE BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLIES ARE BEING TAKEN CARE OF BY THE JOINT DIST. COMMITTEE.

THE JEWS WHO ARE LEAVING CAN SELL THEIR HOUSES BUT CANNOT TAKE THE CURRENCY OUT OF THE COUNTRY. THEY CAN ONLY TAKE POSSESSIONS WHICH THEY CAN CARRY. WE WERE ASKED BY SEVERAL LEADERS TO HELP TRY TO ALTER THIS PUNITIVE DIRECTIVE. AS IN THE PAST, WHEN WORD OF THEIR DEPARTURE REACHES THEIR EMPLOYER, MOST LOSE THEIR JOBS. IN ADDITION, THEY ARE BEING PLAGUED BY ROBBERIES BECAUSE IT IS CONCLUDED THAT THEY ARE STASHING MONEY FROM THEIR SALES. MANY JEWS HAVE TO GO FAR DISTANCES TO GET THEIR VISAS AND RETURN TO THEIR HOMES ONLY TO FIND SQUATTERS ON THEIR LAND. THERE HAVE BEEN INCREASING INSTANCES OF BRUTALITY AND BEATINGS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN SOME DEATHS. THEIR SAFETY IS CONTINGENT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DEMOCRATIC RULE AND A REVITALIZATION OF THE ECONOMY, TWO RESULTS THAT CANNOT BE ANTICIPATED IN THE NEAR FUTURE, FOR SURE. THERE IS NO FUTURE FOR THE JEWS IN UZBEKISTAN. IT IS A DAY TO DAY EXISTENCE. IT IS NOT A PROBLEM OF STARVATION. IT IS A PROBLEM OF THEIR SURVIVAL AND OF A FUTURE.

THE JEWISH AGENCY OFFICE WAS OPENED A YEAR AGO AND THE JOINT HAS BEEN OPERATING THERE SINCE THE REVOLUTION, INCREASING THEIR PRESENCE BEFORE PERESTROIKA (ILLEGALLY AND QUIETLY).

THE JEWISH AGENCY HAS ITS MAIN COORDINATING CENTER IN TASHKENT, WHICH IS CENTRAL TO ANY EMIGRATION. IT HAS OFFICES AS WELL IN ALAMATA, KAJIKISTAN. THEY MONITOR WHAT IS OCCURRING IN THE SURROUNDING REPUBLICS. TAJIKISTAN HAS ITS CIVIL WAR GOING ON AS WE SPEAK, AND THERE IS GREAT FEAR THAT AS A BORDER REPUBLIC THIS HOSTILITY WILL SPILL OVER TO UZBEKISTAN.

MOST RECENTLY, THE JEWISH AGENCY HAD A WHOLE PLANE LOAD OF OLIM WITH VISAS READY TO GO IN TAJIKISTAN AND SUDDENLY THE AIRPORT WAS CLOSED AND THE JEWS WERE LEFT STRANDED. THE JEWISH AGENCY DECIDED TO GO IN THERE WITH BUSES AND WAS ABLE TO GET THEM OUT SAFELY TO TASHKENT WHERE THEY WERE FLOWN TO ISRAEL. THE JEWISH AGENCY NOW ANTICIPATES THAT THEY WILL HAVE ALL OF THE JEWS OUT OF UZBEKISTAN WITHIN TWO YEARS. THOSE WISHING TO STAY WILL BE MONITORED BY THE JOINT. THERE IS A COMPLETE ACCULTURATION PROGRAM FOR THE NEW OLIM PRIOR TO THEIR DEPARTURE, WITH ULPAN AND COUNSELLING ON WHAT THEY SHOULD EXPECT. THE MEN AND WOMEN ASSISTING THE COMMUNITY ARE OUTSTANDING IN THEIR EXPERIENCE AND THEIR SELFLESSNESS. IT WAS PARTICULARLY TOUCHING TO LEARN THAT TWO OF THE ISRAELIS NOW IN PROFESSIONAL ROLES IN TASHKENT WERE OLIM 20 YEARS AGO AND WERE NOW IN A POSITION TO ASSIST OTHERS.

OUR GROUP MET WITH THE U.S. AMBASSADOR, HENRY CLARK, WHO WAS A DEPUTY UNDER AMBASSADOR BILL BROWN IN ISRAEL. HE IS A CAREER OFFICER AND IS ALSO SELFLESS IN AGREEING TO TAKE THIS POST. IT IS NOT EASY. THE UNITED STATES IS IN A DESPERATE SITUATION TO FIND EXPERIENCED DIPLOMATS FOR THESE NEW REPUBLICS AND HAVE REACHED OUT CAREER OFFICERS WHO ARE OFFERED THE MIXED BLESSING OF AN AMBASSADORIAL POSITION, BUT IN POTENTIALLY REMOTE AND DIFFICULT AREAS. CLARK'S ASSISTANTS WERE ALSO WITH

HIM IN ISRAEL. ONE OF THEM IS A JEWISH WOMAN WHO SPEAKS 7 LANGUAGES.

THE U.S. RELATIONSHIP WAS SLOW IN BEING ESTABLISHED IN UZBEKISTAN AS IT WAS NOT HOUSING NUCLEAR COMPONENTS AND THUS WAS NOT A TOP PRIORITY. THE HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE IS A REAL PROBLEM IN OUR RELATIONS THERE. HOWEVER, FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES OF MUTUAL INTEREST DO HELP THE RELATIONSHIP: INVESTMENT, ECONOMY, EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE, ETC.

AS AMERICANS, EXPECTATIONS TO THE REGION SHOULD BE KEPT LOW. THAT WAY, ONE WON'T BE DISAPPOINTED. THE JOB MARKET IS QUITE NARROW IN THE REGION!

OUR ITINERARY TOOK US TO JEWISH CULTURAL CENTERS WHICH WERE PRIMARILY FORMER HOMES OF JEWISH PEOPLE WHO WERE LEAVING THE COUNTRY AND PREFERRED GIVING THEIR HOUSES AWAY TO SELLING THEM AND NOT BEING ABLE TO TAKE THE MONEY. THE DOUBLE ADVANTAGE WAS THAT ALL OF THE ENVIRONMENTS WERE QUITE FRIENDLY.

IN ADDITION, WE VISITED THE FORMER HOME OF A WEALTHY BUSINESSMAN IN SAMARKAND THAT HAS NOW BECOME A TOURIST ATTRACTION AND MOST RECENTLY WAS ACKNOWLEDGED TO BE A JEWISH FAMILY HOME, OBVIOUS BECAUSE OF THERE BEING A PRIVATE SYNAGOGUE ATTACHED.

WE MET WITH LEADERS OF A VERY OLD BUCHARRAN SYNAGOGUE WHICH HAD AN ATTACHED BUILDING THAT IS BEING USED FOR CULTURAL EVENTS AND ANOTHER BUCHARRAN SYNAGOGUE HANDSOMELY PANELED THAT HAD IN ITS POSSESSION AND PLACED IN SECURELY HIDDEN WALL CABINETS 60 TORAHS FROM SYNAGOGUES THAT HAD BEEN CLOSED.

ALL IN ALL, THERE ARE 3 SYNAGOGUES FOR THE BUCHARRAN JEWS AND ONE FOR THE ASHKENAZI. WITH THE ATTACHED CULTURAL CENTER BUILDINGS, IT WAS AMAZING TO SEE THAT IN THAT REMOTE REGION, THE CAMPUS MODEL WAS IN!

WE ATTENDED A BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING OF BUCHARRAN JEWS (PRETTY FAMILIAR!) AND A CULTURAL EVENT WITH DANCING AND SINGING BY YOUNG VOLUNTEER MEMBERS AND OLDER PROFESSIONAL SINGERS AND ACTORS THAT WAS POSITIVELY CHARMING. THEY WERE DRESSED IN TRADITIONAL GARMENTS THAT WERE BOTH COLORFUL AND ROMANTIC.

BY THE WAY, THEY DID MAKE A REQUEST FOR COSTUME MATERIAL AND MAKEUP!

THERE ARE ABOUT 1,000 PEOPLE STUDYING IN ULPAN AND IN THE SCHOOLS AROUND THE CENTER. IN ADDITION TO BEING COUNSELED ON WHAT TO EXPECT IN ISRAEL, THEY ARE TAUGHT PROFESSIONAL TERMINOLOGY SO THAT WHEN THEY GET TO ISRAEL IT WILL BE EASIER FOR THEM TO LOOK FOR JOBS. THEY ARE ALSO LEARNING ABOUT THE

HOLIDAYS, THEIR MEANING AND ACTIVITIES, LEARNING TO SEW, ETC. CHABAD IS CONDUCTING THE SCHOOL CLASSES AND PAYING THE TEACHERS' SALARIES, WHILE THE JOINT AND JEWISH AGENCY PICK UP OTHER COSTS. THERE ARE ONLY AFTERNOON SCHOOLS BECAUSE THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT WILL NOT ALLOW A FULL DAY JEWISH SCHOOL. THE CHILDREN ARE BEING PREPARED TO GO TO ISRAEL. THERE ARE PRESENTLY 400 STUDENTS IN SAMARKAND. TWO HUNDRED HAVE ALREADY LEFT FOR ISRAEL. IN SIX MONTHS, THE POPULATION WILL BE REDUCED AGAIN BY 50%. THE CHABAD RABBI IS ATTRACTIVE AND ENGAGING AND IS WORKING VERY CLOSELY WITH THE SERVICE GROUPS, WHICH IS NOT NECESSARILY THE CASE IN OTHER COMMUNITIES.

THE MOST IMPORTANT MESSAGE THE RABBI BRINGS TO THE CHILDREN IS THAT THEY ARE PART OF A LARGER GROUP, AND HE ENCOURAGES THEM TO GO TO ISRAEL.

THE MOST TOUCHING MOMENT OF THE TRIP WAS ON THE LAST DAY WHEN OUR SMALL GROUP MET WITH YOUNGSTERS WHO WERE GOING TO LEAVE IN DECEMBER, AND THEN LATER WHEN WE BOARDED OUR BUS TO THE AIRPORT AND FOLLOWED A BUS AS IT WENT ON ITS DEFINED ROUTE TO PICK UP THE PEOPLE/FAMILIES WHO WOULD BE MAKING ALIYAH ON THE SAME PLANE. IT IS AN EMOTIONAL ROLLER COASTER THAT HAS TO BE EXPERIENCED -- CHILDREN LEAVING PARENTS, WIVES LEAVING HUSBANDS, WHOLE FAMILIES DEPARTING, FAMOUS AND SIMPLE, OLD AND YOUNG, DOGS, CATS, A FORMULA FOR THE AMOUNT OF LUGGAGE ONE COULD TAKE. LITTLE ANXIETY. LOTS OF COURAGE. A GREAT ATTITUDE PERVADED THE GROUP. BUT IT HAS TO BE AN UPHEAVAL WE CAN'T EVEN IMAGINE. THE PLANES ARE SCHEDULED IN ADVANCE. TWO MONTHS FOR EL AL AND TWO MONTHS FOR UZBEKISTAN AIRLINES (FORMERLY AEROFLOT PLANES). THE LATTER (500 OF THEM) WERE JUST LEFT ON THE TARMACKS WHEN THE FSU WAS BROKEN UP.

OUR TRIP COULD NOT HAVE IMPRESSED US MORE WITH THE VAILITY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF OPERATION EXODUS AND OUR ANNUAL CAMPAIGN. IT IS OUR INVESTMENT IN SAVING LIVES AND SAVING FUTURES BEFORE THE WINDOW CLOSES.

I HOPE THAT WE WILL SUCCESSFULLY GATHER A GROUP TO JOIN A LARGER GROUP THAT WILL BE GOING TO THIS AREA IN THE SPRING. IT IS NOT AN EASY TRIP. IT IS NOT NECESSARILY THE COMFORTS OF HOME. IN FACT, IT IS NOT THE COMFORTS OF HOME! UNLESS YOU BRING YOUR OWN. IT IS A TRIP OF A LIFELINE, A LIFELINE TO JEWISH CONTINUITY. IT IS OUR SIGNAL OF AWARENESS TOWARDS SUPPORTING A JEWISH FUTURE...THE CHILDREN. IT IS A PREVENTATIVE MEASURE AND CHANGING RAPIDLY.

THE JEWS WITH WHOM WE TRAVELED WERE OPENLY EXCITED ABOUT THEIR MOVE AND STRONG IN THEIR DECISION TO LEAVE THEIR PAST FOR A BRIGHTER FUTURE, WITH AN EXTENDED FAMILY. OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS FAMILY MEMBERS IS TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT THEY CAN BE RESCUED, SO THAT THEY CAN SURVIVE IN A POSITIVE, NUTURING, AND PRODUCTIVE, NATION-BUILDING ENVIRONMENT.

Riding On the Crest of Change

A SPECIAL REPORT BY

**ROSELYNE C. SWIG, PRESIDENT
TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION MEMBERSHIP**

FOR THE

ANNUAL MEETING

JUNE 16, 1994



**JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION
OF SAN FRANCISCO, THE PENINSULA, MARIN AND SONOMA COUNTIES**

I NTRODUCTION

In many of the world's Jewish communities -- from Sarajevo to St. Petersburg, from Tashkent to Teheran -- planning for the future is a luxury no one can afford. While serving two years as President of the Jewish Community Federation, the lessons of these faraway places have come home to me.

Now I realize how very fortunate we are to have a community so rich with promise and an organization so well positioned to prepare us for our shared Jewish destiny.

Much has been said about the reality of assimilation facing Jewish communities in the Diaspora and about the importance of the Federation movement in addressing the mounting challenge. As we monitor this ground swell of concern, we are confident that everything we do at the Federation is directed toward the goal of building a stronger Jewish community while meeting the present and future needs of Jews who live around the corner and around the world. That is our mission.

In 1992, prior to assuming the Federation presidency, I wrote my own personal midrash of our mission statement. My purpose was to bring the community building side of our mission in parity with the fundraising side. The words are mine, but the ideas were developed over the years by all those dedicated people who preceded me.

The Federation's Mission Into the 21st Century

To learn from and benefit from our common thread of Jewishness.

To find new ways of meeting and serving our diverse contemporary Jewish population in an evermore sensitive, meaningful and responsive manner.

To explore avenues of communication and understanding that respect the concerns of all Jewish men and women who are looking for meaning in Judaism as a way of life.

In this report, I will endeavor to describe to you the most recent progress that we have made -- as well as the momentous changes we are prepared to make -- in pursuit of our goals.

These changes need not come at any cost to the Federation's strong history of service and our central position of leadership in the Jewish community.

OVERVIEW:

Building on Past Accomplishments

Two years ago when I assumed the role of President, I expressed the desire that the Federation continue to build on the solid accomplishments of those leaders who have gone before us. Today I feel that we have, indeed, implemented that strategy in a way that will keep us on course for a long time to come.

The recession that has ravaged California and the enormous challenge of resettling 2,000 local refugees from the former Soviet Union each year have presented us with great challenges. Still we have continued to build on our strengths in key areas that define us.

Let me share with you a brief overview of these areas of growth....

Maximizing Our Financial Resources

It has become an imperative that we build on the proven strength of our Annual Campaign and the growing success of our Endowment Fund, complementing these spheres of giving with other sources of revenue that are accessible to us.

Our goal is threefold: to meet as many critical needs as possible; to make available to each of our more than 17,000 donors every possible option for giving; and to make the most of each gift by linking it to other available funds. As we *launch our new Financial Resources Development initiative* (see page 5), we should begin to make progress toward all of these goals at once.

Strengthening Our Planning Function

While we research and maximize our financial resources, we also must *expand our planning function*. We must be able to clearly articulate our community's priorities and allocate our considerable funding resources to our network of beneficiary agencies in the most responsible and forward looking manner possible.

Over the years, we have taken an important role in the critical area of setting community priorities. Now we must take ownership. With a stronger planning staff, we will be able to help our agencies, synagogues and other organizations plan in harmony.

Ensuring Jewish Continuity

It is absolutely essential that we strengthen educational and cultural programs at the heart of our Jewishness, a top priority that will *ensure our Jewish continuity*. We must recognize that our Jewish future hinges on bringing more Jews, young and old, especially the uninvolved and unaffiliated, into our community. After all, if we expect to continue taking care of Jews in need -- the frail elderly, the vulnerable young, the homeless, the hungry and the refugee -- then we must continue to build a strong Jewish community to make it all possible.

Reinforcing Our Programs in Israel

The Federation's Overseas Committee is working with the Amuta -- our volunteer advisory group in Israel -- to better focus our funding on those programs that reinforce "shared values" such as democracy and pluralism, as well as on projects that will improve the economy and living conditions in the Northern Galilee, particularly in our adopted city, Kiryat Shmona.

Through annual working visits to Israel, the Overseas Committee is strengthening its relationship with the Amuta and redoubling our commitment to serve as agents of change in the northern region.

Reviewing National Agencies and Overseas Organizations

At the same time that we are renewing our unique commitment to programs in Israel, we have joined with sister federations to *call for a review of our national and overseas agencies* -- the conduits through which much of our funding passes. Our objective is look at the structure and process of these agencies in order to increase their efficiency and accountability.

Developing New Leadership

The key to the ambitious agenda I have just outlined is leadership. The Federation and our Jewish community at large have been blessed with outstanding leadership for many decades.

However, we must work harder than ever to *develop new leadership for the future*, and thus we are establishing a department called Human Resource Development (HRD), which I will touch upon later (see page 4).

REVIEW:

A Remarkably Stable History of Change

Our Federation has a long, proud history of serving as an agent of change. By way of example, we were the first American federation to create our own avenue of interaction with a group of Israeli counterparts, our Amuta, and to directly fund select programs in Israel without using any intermediary funding organization.

This year we were proud and pleased that United Jewish Appeal elected to put in place a national program, a type of twinning arrangement between American Jewish communities and cities in Israel, which is strikingly similar to our Amuta.

Believing as we do that change can be made without losing sight of what we have previously accomplished, we feel that our community can be more inclusive and reach out to interfaith couples, gay families and other non-traditional groups without polarizing any of the many diverse groups already in the community.

Most importantly, the Federation itself must be capable of change. Over the years, the Federation has transformed itself many times. In the 1960s the Federation, then called the Jewish Welfare Federation and concerned mostly with fund-raising, began assuming social planning and budgeting responsibilities together with many of its beneficiary agencies.

In the 1970s, we created the community's first Endowment Fund which, in tandem with our Annual Campaign, shouldered the responsibility for developing new leadership and began building a stronger community through a number of innovative outreach programs. Soon thereafter, we became the Jewish Community Federation.

In the 1980s, as I already have noted, we opened new bridges of communication with Israel, which truly have made us an international organization.

Now, in the middle of the 1990s, we are undertaking the greatest changes yet in order to create the Jewish Community Federation of the future. Essentially, we are looking beyond the short term and reorganizing for the future. Although our Federation today is productive and strong, we absolutely must be proactive to prepare for the challenges that inevitably lie ahead.

CHANGE # 1:

Restructuring the New Federation

In the fall of 1993, our Community Development Department launched a self-study process, chaired by Joelle Steefel and guided by Director Nancy Tamler, which examined how the Federation was planning for the future and developing volunteers to lead the way. It was clear that changes needed to be made. The big question was: When?

Then early this year we became aware of the fact that there would be some decrease in income and further increases in expenses. Federation staff members, lay leaders and many other interested volunteers immediately set to work to devise a new organizational structure that would respond to this fiscal challenge without veering from the course for change we had set.

As Jews, we have learned that we can look beyond the difficulties we face today toward solutions that will serve us well in the future. In short, we have learned to create opportunities in the midst of obstacles.

For instance, the welcome problem of resettling 2,000 new immigrants in the Bay Area each year means that we must find added financial resources in order to provide human services to them. We have overcome this obstacle, and we are taking this opportunity to develop these newcomers into future Federation donors and leaders.

The watchword in our restructuring process is "focus." For instance, although we will have fewer staff members working on the Annual Campaign next year, they will be doing so with complete focus. They will not assume the myriad of non-fund raising tasks that we have assigned to them in the past.

We also will give a great deal of focus to the development of committed volunteers who can lead the Federation and the community into the next century. We refer to our expanded efforts in this all-important arena as Human Resource Development or HRD.

Human Resource Development (HRD)

The keystone of the restructured Federation will be the new department called Human Resources Development (HRD). HRD staff members under the direction of Cindy Rogoway will work with every division and in every region of the Federation to develop new volunteers who eventually will assume the mantel of leadership not only within our organization, but in the greater Jewish community, as well.

One of the flagship programs of HRD will be the Board Leadership Institute, which has grown out of a planning

process conceived by Barbara Isackson and chaired by Stephen Dobbs with considerable input from some 60 service agencies and synagogues in our Federation area. As the name implies, the purpose of the Board Leadership Institute will be to develop and sustain exemplary leadership for the governing boards of a wide variety of Jewish organizations, as well as the Federation.

As conceived, the Institute probably will meet once a month during the coming "academic year." Collateral activities and study will be structured around exercises from existing leadership seminars and lessons from the corporate community, as well as Jewish values, ethics and issues that are germane to anyone serving on an agency or synagogue board.

Participants in the Board Leadership Institute, all rising stars on boards in the community, will be selected for their promise of providing a new constellation of leaders in the future.

Strengthening Our Planning and Allocations Function

Finally, the Federation must expand its Planning and Allocations efforts under the direction of Richard Sipser so that we can assume more efficiently and intelligently the enormous responsibility that goes with allocating upwards of \$30 million in a given year. Indeed, we fully expect to see even greater growth in the funds allocated from our Annual Campaign, Endowment Fund, special campaigns and other sources thanks to our Financial Resources Development initiative (see this page).

The processes of allocating Annual Campaign funds, chaired by Harold Zlot, and distributing monies from the Endowment Fund, chaired by Peter Sloss, were more thorough this year than ever before. Yet, these processes, too, can be integrated further in a synergistic way in order to achieve the greatest positive impact with the financial resources we have at our command.

The need for human services in the Bay Area -- especially care for our growing population of frail elderly-- will continue to increase. There will be Jewish refugees pouring out of the former Soviet Union for years to come. The Federation will continue to play the central role in fundraising for capital building projects in our community.

Most important of all perhaps, there is our determination to protect our Jewish heritage through a broad spectrum of educational programs -- the general area of concern that we refer to as preserving Jewish continuity and identity.

All of the above are critical reasons for strengthening our Planning and Allocations function as the Federation and our Jewish community prepare to enter the 21st Century.

CHANGE # 2: *Financial Resource Development (FRD)*

The Federation's highest priority is, and has always been, to provide quality human services and cultural/educational programs to all those who need them.

More than 60 agencies are funded by our Annual Campaign, and many more receive funding through the Federation's Jewish Community Endowment Fund. Some local Jewish services also are funded with local, state and Federal monies. Others, including our network of refugee services, receive indirect funding from sister federations across the country.

These financial resources, already available through the Federation, are unparalleled in our community. Still, we believe they could be much, much greater, and we are now embarking on a strategy to grow our resources.

The Financial Resource Development (FRD) Committee and Chair John Freidenrich have been working to assess our capacity for growth. Their findings are very encouraging. Our research and development efforts in FRD will take us into public funding arenas, Jewish foundations and other private foundations, plus our own Annual Campaign and Endowment Fund.

The Federation's Investment Committee, chaired by John Osterweis, is responsible for the selection and monitoring of outside investment managers. The Committee's success gives us further reason to believe that as we secure new resources, we will make the best possible use of them.

FRD & the Annual Campaign

Under the stewardship of Chairman Bernard Osher and Director Stacie Sandler, the 1994 Campaign has raised roughly \$18 million (compared to \$17.7 million last year), an astonishing total in

light of the recession-racked economy in Northern California.

Although the Annual Campaign remains strong with its core of some 17,000 donors and yearly revenues exceeded only by the Bay Area United Way, we have felt for many years that we could be significantly more productive. To that end, we are realigning our staff members at the central office and in the regions so that those who work on the Campaign work only on the Campaign.

Our Campaign professionals traditionally have carried the responsibilities of planning, outreach and educational events in their regions and divisions, while performing all manner of administrative tasks. Now the Campaign will be given top priority by those who work on it. The difficult challenge of reaching even our most dedicated donors in today's cluttered marketplace demands no less.

FRD & the Endowment Fund

Under the leadership of Chairman Peter Haas and Director Phyllis Cook, the Federation's Endowment Fund now has assets in excess of \$130 million. The Endowment Fund, of course, is comprised of many different funds.

Some donors make *unrestricted gifts*, which allow the Federation to respond to emergencies and fund innovative new programs as they arise. Others make *restricted gifts* or create funds in specific fields of interest, such as Jewish education or care for the elderly. As part of the proposed new Financial Resources Development initiative, the Federation hopes to focus on developing "field of

"interest" gifts so that donors can make contributions in areas of particular concern to them.

As it becomes more focused in setting community priorities, the Federation will be able to alert Endowment Fund donors to programs worthy of funding that support these priorities. Thus donors can measure and merge their own individual interests and concerns with those of the Jewish community at large.

One very special form of restricted giving is an endowed gift to the Federation's Annual Campaign. By perpetuating their gifts to the Campaign, donors ensure that the community will have an adequate source of funds to meet ongoing needs from year to year.

In the coming year, I know the Endowment Fund will reach out to donors at every level with advantageous vehicles for giving, including the bequest, which one can execute by including the Federation in one's will. I applaud this effort particularly, because many of our most loyal donors to the Annual Campaign, people who have given for 10, 20 and 30 years, are capable of leaving a gift in their wills. We simply need to inform them that they can leave a lasting legacy of their personal commitment through the Federation's Endowment Fund.

FRD & Special Campaigns

Over the past four years the Federation has raised more than \$31 million for Operation Exodus, our special campaign, currently chaired by Bill Lowenberg, to rescue and resettle Jews from the former Soviet Union. These dollars have helped

nearly 500,000 Jewish refugees begin new lives in Israel and have enabled 10,000 more to be reunited with their families in our local Federation area.

Last autumn I was privileged to see Operation Exodus in action in Uzbekistan. With a small group of Federation leaders, including my successor as President, Doug Heller, I witnessed the miracle that our support has helped make possible in Tashkent and Samarkand, as in so many other cities throughout the 15 states of the former Soviet Union.

With funding from Operation Exodus, the Jewish Agency works hand-in-glove with remnant Jewish communities in the so-called Muslim republics to expedite the rescue of Jewish refugees and speed their resettlement in Israel. I shall never forget sitting with a group of Bucharan Jews in the courtyard of the Jewish Agency's makeshift headquarters, waiting for a bus to the airport in Tashkent. Because these people were about to begin new lives, they were of necessity leaving an old life and old friends behind.

Sitting in the chill of that October afternoon, I was grateful and proud that Operation Exodus was there and would take care of those who were left behind, as well as those who were leaving.

Our local Operation Exodus effort -- one of the most successful in the country -- along with Operation Solomon for Ethiopian Jewry and similar campaigns in the past, illustrates how the Federation can rally our community around a massive emergency and meet a challenge head on.

The rescue and resettlement of Jews from the former USSR will be an ongoing objective for years to come. Fund raising for this effort may be brought together under the umbrella of the Annual Campaign, through our Endowment Fund, via other foundations and as a result of continued advocacy in all those forums where government funding is determined. Wherever and whenever the challenge is met, this will be a further example of our Financial Resource Development initiative in action.

FRD & Capital Campaigns

As we did in the creation of the Hoyt Marin Jewish Community Campus, the Federation now is playing a critical role in the rebuilding of the San Francisco Jewish Community Center as a multi-service campus. The planning process for the new San Francisco facility, launched under the Federation's aegis, is now well underway. Architectural plans have been commissioned, and soon fund raising will begin in a concerted manner.

The Federation also has been involved in the effort to secure the building site for a new multi-purpose North Peninsula Jewish Community Center in a more central location, and in addition we have been negotiating with various developers in San Francisco toward the goal of creating a much needed new senior housing facility in the city.

To a great extent, as we develop these projects and as we create vehicles for giving to carry them forward, we will find new donors who are interested in supporting them. This, essentially, is

what Financial Resource Development is all about.

By the end of President Heller's term, I fully believe that this Federation will be ranked among the most innovative and versatile philanthropic enterprises on the West Coast thanks to our Financial Resource Development initiative.

CHANGE # 3:

The Revitalized Jewish Continuity Thrust

As we prepare for the Jewish community of the 21st Century, we know that future will be realized under the rubric of *Jewish continuity*.

Preserving our heritage as Jews, whether we are Conservative, Reform, Orthodox, non-religious or "other," is a most challenging task in the busy, demanding world we share. Sociologists tell us that each one of us -- Jew and non-Jew alike -- is searching for a sense of community as families spread out across the continent and neighborhoods lose their ethnic identities. In a sense, most people in the U.S. now live in a "diaspora."

As Jews, we are very fortunate to have a strong tradition that binds us together and preserves our uniqueness no matter how scattered and assimilated we become. Creating and funding programs that highlight our traditions is the essence of our Jewish continuity thrust.

Jewish Family Education Initiative

Over the past year, I have been involved in the National Commission on Jewish

Continuity. It is with this perspective I can tell you that our Federation's Jewish Family Education Task Force, at work most of the past year, is going to make us once again an agent for change.

In the Federation world, we have had many task forces over the years. Looking back it is clear that they all flowed together and that one task force begat another, much like the lineage of Abraham and Sarah in the Bible.

In July 1992, at the beginning of my presidency, I asked Dr. Susan Folkman to chair our then new Task Force on Federation-Synagogue Relations. During the following year, a number of meetings were held with synagogue representatives -- rabbis, lay leaders and others -- through the Federation area.

A central question of this initial task force was: How can the Federation, its agencies and local synagogues work together to help individuals overcome barriers -- psychological, physical, economic and social -- and affiliate with the Jewish community and Jewish life?

Several major recommendations came out of that task force, one of which was the need to create and fund more Jewish family education programs.

Thus the Task Force on Federation-Synagogue Relations begat the Jewish Family Education Task Force.

Chaired by Ellen Kahn, the thrust of the Jewish Family Education Task Force has been to clarify our objectives and identify programs worthy of funding, which will help unaffiliated Jews weave Jewish traditions and values into the

fabric of their families. At the same time, we hope to draw those families into our Jewish community, particularly into our community of synagogues.

To this end, the Federation's Endowment Fund has just approved a large grant to the Bureau of Jewish Education to establish the Jewish Family Education Project. Funded by the grant, a full-time Jewish Family Educator will work with an interagency council to create programs at synagogues, JCCs and other service providers in our community.

But the lineage of Jewish continuity programs will not end here.

Sometime early in the near future, a Federation president should be able to say: that the Task Force on Federation-Synagogue Relations begat the Jewish Family Education Task Force... which begat the Task Force on Teens... which begat the Task Force on Services on Campus....

Which begat the Task Force for Jews in Their 20s... which begat the Task Force on Evaluation in Jewish Education, and so on and on... until the present has quietly become the future.

Other Initiatives in Jewish Continuity

As a variation on the Jewish Family Education Project, Kol Shofar, a conservative synagogue in Marin, is creating a unique outreach program with seed funding from the Federation's Endowment Fund. At Kol Shofar, a Jewish "personal trainer" will work with individual families to build a more Jewish life around the activities of their children.

Meeting at the synagogue on Shabbat, the "trainer" then will help the families fold the traditions they are learning into the activities of the synagogue.

Although Kol Shofar hopes the program will lead to increased membership in that synagogue, they believe it will serve all the area synagogues as an invaluable "training" ground for members.

Of course, there is a financial cost to the clients of all these wonderful educational/cultural services that our camps, our schools, our JCCs and our synagogues provide.

As has been reported many times in stories in the *Northern California Jewish Bulletin*, a great number of local Jews simply cannot afford to be Jewish. The cost of tuitions, memberships and other fees is beyond them.

This is why it is more important than ever that we make certain singles, parents and children are not barred from Jewish education, Jewish camping experiences, Jewish life cycle events and visits to Israel, because of the cost.

LOOKING AHEAD: *So Many Reasons To Be Hopeful*

Last year I concluded my report by listing and lauding some of the extraordinary projects that had been accomplished in each of our five regions -- San Francisco, the North and South Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma County -- as well as in Young Adults Division, Women's Division and so on.

Not surprisingly, that wonderful work not only has continued, but gained momentum. I am at a loss for words to describe the optimism I feel as I look back over two years of working alongside Federation volunteers and staff members from Petaluma to Palo Alto.

This year, rather than inventory the accomplishments of the Federation itself, I would like to cite advances made by just a few of the more than 40 local agencies funded through our Annual Campaign. Again, this list is just the briefest introduction to work made possible through Federation funding:

Highlights of Local Services

Albert L. Shultz Jewish Community Center -- established a partnership with the Cardiac Therapy Foundation to provide exercise programs for JCC members suffering from heart problems.

Bay Area Council for Soviet Jews -- Worked directly with the St. Petersburg Jewish community to develop the first ever Jewish communal infrastructure in this western Russian city.

Brandeis Hillel Day School of Marin and San Francisco -- Experimented with the use of video technology in Hebrew language; now is developing a curriculum around that experience.

Bureau of Jewish Education -- Board members and staff worked together to create a strategic plan for the agency, defining its mission and plotting its long term future serving local Jewish schools and synagogues.

Hillel, San Francisco -- Sponsored a multi-cultural conference on the issues of women from different ethnic, racial and religious backgrounds.

Holocaust Center of Northern California -- Staged 35 high school assemblies, trained 400 teachers and reached over 20,000 children in the wake of interest that followed the release of the film, *Schindler's List*.

The Israel Project -- Took its award-winning educational road show, "The Caravan," to nine Northern California college campuses to display positive images of Israeli life and culture.

Jewish Community Museum San Francisco -- Mounted four significant exhibits attracting record crowds and will celebrate its 10th anniversary with the show, "60 Treasures," to open in September 1994.

Jewish Family and Children's Services -- Helped more than 35,000 people last year through services ranging from the Adoption Connection to the Tenderloin Project; launched the new Dream House for battered women.

Jewish Film Festival -- After entertaining the largest summer audience in its 13-year history, the Festival reached an estimated 460,000 viewers through the airing of six Jewish films over a four-week period on KQED-TV.

Jewish Vocational Services -- Provided over 5,000 clients with a comprehensive program of career counseling, job search training and one of the largest *now hiring* lists in the Bay Area.

Jewish Home for the Aged -- Continued construction on the Howard A. Friedman Pavilion, which will become home to 120 residents in the spring of 1995.

Lehrhaus Judaica -- Provided more than 100 classes, lectures and workshops to over 3,000 adults at 15 local sites.

Mt. Zion Health Systems, Inc. -- Developed *Ruach Ami*, an organization that brings together the chaplaincy service, the Jewish Healing Center and the Jewish hospice program to provide spiritual care to Jews in hospitals.

North Peninsula Jewish Community Day School -- Launched a new marketing and outreach strategy to promote the school to marginally affiliated parents.

United Jewish Community Centers -- Worked with the Federation on a special task force to evaluate the financial and managerial services provided by this central organization to three local JCCs and Camp Tawonga.

Honoring Initiative in our Community

In addition to the work of the Federation and the many agencies that we fund, there are scores of other programs and thousands of volunteers whose work is deemed especially worthy of respect and recognition.

Each year a Federation committee chaired by Larry Myers selects three individuals or programs that are particularly deserving. These are the winners of the Federation's 1994 Awards of Excellence.

1994 Award of Excellence Winners

Program of the Year -- Chicken Soupers,
A Special Meal Delivery Program for
Jewish People with AIDS

*Volunteer of the Year -- Emanuel
Friedman, M.D.,* for his work over the
years with many different Bay Area
Jewish Organizations

*Professionals of the Year -- Jerry Levine
and Sandra Epstein,* Executive Director
and Administrator at the Jewish Home
for the Aged

***Saluting David Steirman –
1994 Dinkelspiel Award Winner***

Generosity of spirit and heartfelt commitment is the secret of true leadership. These qualities are personified in this year's winner of the Dinkelspiel Award -- David Steirman.

David truly is a remarkable young man who already has made a lasting contribution to our community. For two years running he has chaired our Annual Campaign effort in the North Peninsula, and prior to that he held a number of leadership positions, including the presidency, in our Young Adults Division.

David serves on a number of key committees, including Capital Funds and Personnel, where his intellect and initiative constantly give veteran committee members great confidence that the future of the Federation and our community is in very strong hands.

**LOOKING BACK:
*Final Reflections***

I began my term as President one year after the arrival of our new Executive Director, Wayne Feinstein. I was prepared to share my priorities and at the same time learn from a fine professional who already had served many years as a top executive in his field.

Both Wayne and I came to our roles with a clarity of purpose and a desire to develop a vision that would move the Federation forward. I feel very fortunate now to have developed such a close and positive relationship with Wayne. With the support of the Federation's Board of Directors, I know he will provide meaningful leadership and a strategic roadmap that will be clear, well defined and illuminating for years to come.

I want to thank Wayne personally for his undivided support during my term of office. I learned a great deal from him and drew heavily on his intellect and unwavering commitment to his profession during an extraordinary time.

To the staff of the Federation... I owe great thanks for their loyalty, their unceasing energy and their unstinting efforts on behalf of the Jewish community. I am in absolute awe of the deep concern they showed as they addressed abounding needs.

And now to our Board of Directors... It is the unequivocal responsibility of the Board to debate and make decisions on behalf of the Federation. I am witness to the fact that this Board, without

question, stood to all the issues and gave their best effort to resolve or bring to action all of the difficult challenges brought before them.

I have never felt so in touch with a group of volunteers or so connected to a mission as at the Federation. Early on, I stated clearly that the success of our efforts and the spirit of our actions would be heightened by the degree of participation and input that individual Board Members brought to the table. I asked for 100 percent, and I was never disappointed.

One by one, our Board Members brought outstanding leadership and guidance during trying times and through complex debates. They were tenacious as they participated in long and sometimes frustrating processes. They brought tremendous energy and creativity to whatever I asked them to do.

Collectively, the Board provided me with the confidence to make decisions and to look to them for sincere and honest input. I am and forever will be grateful to them for their availability, their unity and their willingness to make things work.

I want to make special mention of friends and colleagues who work at Jewish Community Relations Council... Their agenda and actions impact directly on all of us, and with their help, Federation leaders are able to make informed statements and sensitive decisions. I often relied on the outstanding judgement of JCRC Director Doug Kahn and President Mike Jacobs, and I remain deeply impressed with their

ability to address potentially dangerous issues and bring opposing groups together in meaningful dialogue.

* * * *

My vision for the Jewish community is one that has us all working together toward common goals. It is a vision that takes pride in the past, but is alert to the challenges of the future.

I envision a community that prides itself on its ability to respond, that is ready to take risks, to be innovative, to ride the crest of change... a community that is warm and welcoming, and provides access to all Jews wherever and whenever they wish to participate... a community that rejects stereotypes and respects the ideas and lifestyles of everyone... a community that is enriched by its Jewish heritage and draws on its Jewish memories... a community that is at ease with itself, as well as demanding of itself... a community that asks the ongoing questions: Who are we and where are we going?... a community that wishes to leave a legacy of substance and support, of love and respect... and finally, a community that understands the importance of the Federation in its future.

And now to my family... We have for many years been active members of the Jewish community. This is the legacy of our parents and grandparents, who saw volunteerism as a responsibility, as well as an enrichment of the heart and soul.

My dear husband Dick and I have worked as a team in our efforts to live up to the legacy of our parents.

I know that I would never have been able to give so fully of myself without Dick's loving and caring support. We have shared our commitment with our family and friends, but it is the encouragement that we receive from each other that enriches our lives, gives us meaning and helps us reach out to others.

So to you, Dick, I thank you again and again for being there for me, for the endless stream of confidence building moments that we have shared.

May we look on this time as a blessing and remember it always.

1993-94 Officers of the Board

PRESIDENT, CHAIRMAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Roselyne C. Swig

VICE PRESIDENTS

John Freidenrich • John D. Goldman • Barbara Isackson • Debra Pell • Harold S. Zlot

TREASURER

Alan E. Rothenberg

ASSISTANT TREASURER
Stephen S. Leavitt, M.D.

SECRETARY
Carol D. Saal

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
Douglas M. Heller

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
Wayne L. Feinstein

ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
Phyllis Cook, Nate Levine

1993-94 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Marc Abramowitz, Norman Berkman, Rabbi Richard A. Block, Neill H. Brownstein, Marshall Denenberg, Stephen M. Dobbs, Andy Elkind, Susan Folkman, Robert Galoob, Sally Gradinger, Francis M. Greenwall, Stanley Herzstein, Russell S. Holdstein, Roean Iscoff, Ellen I. Kahn, Karen Katz, Robert M. Levison Jr., Alvin T. Levitt, Victor L. Marcus, Sora Lei Newman, John S. Osterweis, Peter Pollat, M.D., Ellen Saliman, Susan Scherman, Richard S. Seiler, Stuart Seiler, Joelle Steefel, David Steirman, Richard L. Swig, Keith R. Tandowsky, Igor Tartakovsky, Marilyn Waldman, Melvin Wasserman, Kathy Williams, Sheldon H. Wolfe, Howard Zack, Roberta Zucker

HONORARY DIRECTORS

Jerome I. Braun, Annette Dobbs, Jesse Feldman, Richard N. Goldman, Frances D. Green, Peter E. Haas, Ron Kaufman, William J. Lowenberg, Laurence E. Myers, Donald H. Seiler, Robert E. Sinton, John H. Steinhart

CONSTITUENT AGENCIES

Bureau of Jewish Education, Hebrew Free Loan Association,
Jewish Family & Children's Services, Jewish Home for the Aged, Jewish Vocational Service,
Maimonides Hospital and Nursing Home, Mount Zion Health Systems,
United Jewish Community Centers

1993-94 Professional Staff

155

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Wayne Feinstein

Patrice Rodda, Admin. Assist.

ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Director of Operations/Capital Funds

Nate Levine

Barbara Johnson, Admin. Assist.

ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dir., Endowment/Overseas Operations

Phyllis Cook

Lisa Gurwitch, Assoc. Dir.

Deborah Sloss, Grants Mgr.

Betsy Fraser, Admin. Assist.

Chris Sahagian, Admin. Assist.

Sylvia Soderstrom, Admin. Assist.

Anne McEntorffer, Admin. Assist.

Director, Overseas Department

Nancy Chodosh

Elizabeth Gandy, Admin. Assist.

Director, Israel Office

Natan Golan

Dorit Blauvstein, Kiryat Shmona Office Coord.

Susan Ivry, Secretary

DIR., PLANNING & ALLOCATIONS

Richard Sipser

David Fisch, Planning Assoc.

Melinna Askin, Admin. Assist.

Director, Community Development

Nancy Tamler

Rinat Fried, Admin. Assist.

DIRECTOR, ANNUAL CAMPAIGN

Stacie Sandler

Sarah Druss, Comm. Camp. Coord.

Regional Director, San Francisco

Todd Stettner

Talia Pierluissi, Assoc. Reg. Dir., S.F.

Lisa Selig, Admin. Assist.

Lisa Buckley, Admin. Assist.

Director, Young Leadership

Katherine Tick

Gayle Levin, Admin. Assist.

Director, Young Adults Division

Elliot Brandt

Super Sunday Director

Katherine Tick

Women's Division Director

Amy Rosenblatt Lui

Mairin O'Mahony, Admin. Assist.

Regional Director, Marin/Sonoma

Carolyn Metz

Scott Nebenzahl, Campaign Assoc.

Claudette Greenblat, Admin. Assist.

Jean Tyler, Admin. Assist.

Regional Director, South Peninsula

Al Platt

Karen Kennan, Sen. Assoc. Dir.

Nancy Melmon, Campaign Assoc.

Gail Foelsch, Admin. Assist.

Michelle Jordan, Admin. Assist.

Rachel Louis, Admin. Assist.

Regional Director, North Peninsula

Cindy Rogoway

Julie Gaines, No. Pen. Women's Div.

Jennifer Dorsay, Admin. Assist.

DIR., FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

Gerry Majer

Dan Kushner, Controller

Barbara Klapper, Assist. Controller/
Endowment Controller

Rachelle Feldman, Acctg. Manager

Dan Shiner, Acctg. Special Projects

Paula Goren, Payroll & Benefits Supervisor

Slava Solopova, Accounts Payable Clerk

Jennie Chan, Accounts Receivable Clerk

Jane MacInnis, Admin. Assist.

Director, Information Systems

Paul Raczyński

Doris Hartmann, Word Processing Manager

Jackie Logan, Software Trainer

Chuck Stanton, Programmer/Analyst

Rafael Alicante, Operator/Data Entry

Lourdes Tanchoco, Data Entry

Arina Vander, Data Entry

DIRECTOR, COMMUNICATIONS

Mike Welch

Suzan Berns, Assoc. Dir.

Debbie Cohen, Assist. Dir.

Mary Paquin, Art/Print Dir.

Jane Angermann, Admin. Assist.

DIRECTOR, PERSONNEL/BUILDING

Elle Hoffnagel

Rona Kardener, Admin. Assist.

Bob Griepenburg, Mailroom Supervisor

Rich Moore, General Building Custodian

Barbara Hebert, Switchboard Operator

Special Events consultant

Susan Mall

Senior Housing Consultant

Rick Crane

JCF SPEECHJCF Annual MeetingJune 16, 1994

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF SERVING YOU. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT I HAVE ENJOYED THE PAST TWO YEARS, LEARNED FROM THEM, AND BEEN ENRICHED, PHILOSOPHICALLY, INTELLECTUALLY, AND EMOTIONALLY.

MY TIME HAS BEEN ONE OF NON-STOP ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTIVE DISCUSSION THAT HAS GIVEN ME INSIGHT INTO HOW TO BALANCE OUR EVER-GROWING AGENDA. HOWEVER, JUST THE CHANCE TO MAKE NEW FRIENDS WAS ENOUGH TO MAKE THE TIME SPENT ENRICHING AND GRATIFYING ... AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO STRENGTHEN LONG-STANDING RELATIONSHIPS WAS THE ICING ON THE CAKE ... I LOVED IT AND WILL TAKE THOSE MEMORIES WITH ME TO CHERISH AND TO NURTURE

SOMEONE SAID AT THE OUTSET THAT THIS EXPERIENCE WOULD CHANGE MY LIFE ...AND I CONFESS I THOUGHT THAT WAS A PRETTY DRAMATIC STATEMENT. NOW, I HAVE TO AGREE THAT YOU DO GAIN AN INVALUABLE INSIGHT ONTO LIFE'S STAGE AND INTO ONE'S OWN LIFE THAT BECOMES CLEARER AS ONE PREPARES TO MOVE ON .

YOU GAIN INSIGHT INTO HUMAN BEHAVIOR, INTO WHY PEOPLE DO WHAT THEY DO, WHAT MOTIVATES THEM , WHAT FOSTERS RESPONSES, AND WHAT ENGAGES THEM OR KEEPS THEM FROM BECOMING FULL PARTNERS.

ONE GAINS INSIGHT INTO TRUTH, INTEGRITY, AND RESPECT AND HOW THOSE WORDS ARE INTERPRETED AND VALUED ... AND TOWARDS OPPORTUNITIES THAT INFUSE ENERGY AND RADIATE LOVE, PURPOSE, AND AFFIRMATION OF HUMAN POTENTIAL AND THAT CHAMPIONS RESPECT FOR SELF AND BRINGS ALONG THE RESPONSIBILITY , THE OBLIGATION, TO SHARE THOSE INSIGHTS WITH OTHERS. IT IS AN EXPERIENCE THAT CAN BE FLEETING AND VULNERABLE TO INTIMIDATION AND TO DISBELIEVERS ... BUT REGAINS ITS STRENGTH AND POWER AS IT IS PROTECTED IT, NURTURED, REMEMBERED.

IN RETIRING, I HAVE MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS... AND I ACCEPT THAT AS A POSITIVE STATE OF MIND FOR FURTHER GROWTH, FOR INQUIRY, FOR HUMILITY, AND PERHAPS THAT IS AS IT SHOULD BE AS IT MEANS THE CONTINUING OF THE RESPONSIBILITY I CARRY AS A JEW ... TO LISTEN, TO LEARN, TO SERVE, TO PLAN, TO COMPLETE, AND TO BEGIN AGAIN.

WHEN I BEGAN MY TERM BUILDING ON MY PREDECESSORS' ACHIEVEMENTS, I FOCUSED ON ASPECTS OF NATIONAL PRIORITY: JEWISH CONTINUITY, IDENTITY, AND INCLUSION -- NATIONAL BUZZWORDS THAT REFLECTED A STATE OF EMERGENCY THAT OUR JEWISH WORLD HAS CONFRONTED AND MUST CONTINUE TO ADDRESS, RESOLVE, AND REPAIR. WITH THE SUPPORT OF THE BOARD OUR FINE JCF STAFF, THE BOARD INITIATED TASK FORCES THAT ADDRESSED THESE ISSUES. IN EVERY CASE, WE BENEFITED FROM THE COMMITMENT AND EXPERIENCE OF OUR LAY AND PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AND OTHER VOLUNTEERS AS WE RESEARCHED, AND HELD RESPECTFUL DISCUSSIONS THAT BROUGHT FORTH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR ACTIONS. RESPONSIBLE DECISIONS BY RESPONSIBLE MEN AND WOMEN ... REPRESENTING EVERY CONSTITUENCY IN OUR FEDERATION FAMILY.

THE BOOKLET YOU HAVE AT YOUR PLACES "RIDING ON THE CREST OF CHANGE" IS OUR ANNUAL REPORT CARD AND WE SHOULD ALL TAKE PRIDE IN ITS CONTENTS ... AND IN OUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS. IT CAN BE USED AS A REFERENCE, FOR INQUIRY, FOR DEBATE, AND TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY IT SHOULD BE USED AS A REMINDER THAT WORDS COME ALIVE ONLY IN THE DOING ... AND THAT TRUE ACCOMPLISHMENT OCCURS WHEN THE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES VOTED UPON BECOME A REALITY. IT IS

"HANDS-ON" VOLUNTEERISM, REAL WORK AND EFFORT THAT MOVES US ALL FORWARD.

THE EXTRAORDINARY RESPONSIBILITY OF BEING JEWISH IS EXPENSIVE AND DRAINING ... PHYSICALLY, EMOTIONALLY, AND FINANCIALLY ... HOWEVER TO WHAT EXPENSE ? FOR OURSELVES AND JEWS, EVERYWHERE, IF WE EVER STEP BACK FROM OUR HISTORICAL COMMITMENT .. AND TO WHAT EXPENSE OF OURSELVES AS INDIVIDUALS, IF WE LOSE OUR FOCUS AND STOP SHORT OF OUR OWN FULFILLMENT AS THINKING, CARING JEWISH MEN AND WOMEN... AS A PEOPLE WHO HAVE THIS AWESOME , ONGOING HISTORICAL OPPORTUNITY TO HELP SHAPE THEIR DESTINY AND ARE PART OF A LIFE-GIVING, EMPOWERING, COMMUNITY-BUILDING , GLOBAL JEWISH AGENDA THAT FEW OTHERS THAT WE KNOW WILL EVER COME CLOSE TO ENJOYING. .. OR REALIZING.

LOOK BACK ON WHERE WE HAVE COME FROM AND BE PROUD OF WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED. LOOK TO WHAT YOU HAVE PROVIDED AND BE GRATEFUL FOR THE COMFORT YOU HAVE BROUGHT TO OTHERS ... AND GAIN STRENGTH AND BE ENERGIZED BY WHAT YOU SEE AROUND YOU ... CHALLENGES YET TO BE ADDRESSED, AND BE HUMBLED BY THE KNOWLEDGE THAT WE ARE THE CHOSEN, CHOSEN TO PICK UP THAT JEWISH MANTLE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND LEADERSHIP ... TO PROVIDE QUALITY AND EXCELLENCE FOR OURSELVES, OUR

FAMILIES, FOR THOSE LESS FORTUNATE AND FOR ALL JEWISH CHILDREN WHO ARE OUR FUTURE.

OUR LEGACY IS RIDING ON THE CREST OF CHANGE ... WE ARE POISED TO MAKE STRATEGIC DECISIONS AND TAKE ACTION THAT BRINGS ALONG ELEMENTS OF RISK ... WE ARE CHALLENGED TO REMEMBER WHO WE ARE AND WHERE WE COME FROM AND TO REMEMBER THOSE FORCES FOR CHANGE THAT CAME BEFORE US AND WE MUST WORK HARD TO STIR THE HEARTS AND MEMORIES OF OTHERS LESS INVOLVED, MOVING THEM TO BREAK DOWN SELF-IMPOSED BARRIERS AND TO FIND THE COMFORT LEVELS FOR ACCESS AND INCLUSION THAT WILL ENGAGE THEIR INTEREST BRINGING TO US FRESH POINTS OF VIEW, RENEWED VIBRANCY, RELEVANCY AND INTELLIGENT AND INSIGHTFUL DIALOGUE THAT KEEPS OUR FEDERATION BUOYANT, ENERGIZED AND RESPONSIVE.

I AM A STRONG ADVOCATE OF OUR FEDERATION SYSTEM AND I LEAVE MINDFUL OF THE WINDS OF CHANGE SWEEPING THROUGH AND SHAKING OUR CONFIDENCE IN OURSELVES AND IN WHAT, HOW, AND WHY WE ARE DOING WHAT WE ARE DOING ... YOU AND I HAVE TO BE MINDFUL OF OUR PURPOSE, OUR MISSION, AND OF OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AND TO STAY FOCUSED AND REMAIN CONFIDENT OF THE VALUE WE PLACE ON THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OURSELVES, HERE, AND FOR JEWS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD ... YOUR NEW PRESIDENT AND HIS BOARD WILL PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP THAT WILL PUSH US TO

BE INTROSPECTIVE AND OF OUR MOTIVES AND OUR GOALS . . . IT IS IN KNOWING OURSELVES, AND FEELING A COMFORT LEVEL WITH OUR JEWISHNESS THAT WE WILL ADDRESS THESE IMPORTANT QUESTIONS AND RESPOND AS A COMMUNITY, AS A FAMILY.

WE HAVE HAD THE BENEFIT OF A DEDICATED AND COMMITTED STAFF AND BOARD THAT CONSISTENTLY ROSE TO GREAT HEIGHTS IN THEIR LEADERSHIP ABILITIES AND THEIR COMMITMENTS TO EXCELLENCE. THEY CAME THROUGH IN ACTION AND IN DEED, AND FOR THAT WE SHOULD ALL BE VERY GRATEFUL. THEY MOTIVATED ME TO PUSH THE EDGE OF THE ENVELOPE OF OUR AGENDA AND TO CHALLENGE OURSELVES. THEY ACCEPTED AND FORGAVE ERRORS OF JUDGMENT AND HELPED IN THEIR RESOLUTIONS... THEY WERE RESPECTFUL AND OF GOOD HUMOR AT OUR MEETINGS AND THEY LISTENED, ASKED QUESTIONS, DEBATED AND GAVE WISE AND MEANINGFUL COUNSEL.. THEY WERE NOT SHY... AND THEY STAYED INVOLVED ... AND I AM TWICE BLESSED FOR THAT... TO THEM, AND TO YOU, MY LOVING THANKS FOR YOUR TIME, YOUR MINDS, AND YOUR ENERGIES ... TO MY FAMILY, EVER MINDFUL OF THE TIME AWAY FROM YOU ... YOU WERE ALWAYS IN MY THOUGHTS ... AND OFTEN IN MY DISCUSSIONS... I THANK YOU FOR YOUR THOUGHTFUL SUPPORT AND FOR ALLOWING ME ... (OFTEN UNBEKNOWNST TO YOU) TO USE YOU AS A REFERENCE, AS AN EXAMPLE, AS A SOUNDING BOARD, AS A REALITY CHECK ON WHAT I (WE) WERE DOING AND WHERE WE

MIGHT BE GOING ... YOU KEPT ME CENTERED AND AWARE AND MADE ME REALIZE HOW STRONG AND YET HOW VULNERABLE OUR JEWISH COMMUNITY IS . AT THE SAME TIME YOU SHOWED ME HOW FORTUNATE WE ARE AS A COMMUNITY TO HAVE SUCH BRIGHT THINKING, SENSITIVE YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN IN OUR MIDST ... AND YOUR HEARTFELT COMMITMENTS TO REACHING OUT TO YOUR COMMUNITY TOUCH ME DEEPLY AND GIVES ME HOPE... BUT NOTHING AFFECTS ME AS DEEPLY AS THE LOVE AND SUPPORT WE HAVE SHOWN FOR EACH OTHER.... AND SO I THANK YOU, YOU FROM MY PAST, YOU IN MY PRESENT, AND YOU FORWARD AND INTO THE FUTURE ... YOU ARE MY LEARNING FIELD AND WE ARE STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ALIKE ON A LIFE PATH OF CONTINUING EDUCATION....

TOMORROW , AS I BASK IN THE WARMTH OF THIS EVENING, I WILL AT THE SAME TIME BEGIN TO TURN MY ATTENTION TO A NEW PHASE OF MY LIFE ... AND BEGIN THE PREPARATION OF A MOVE TO WASHINGTON D.C. AND A NEW RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION... A RESPONSIBILITY THAT WILL TAKE ME OUT OF THE CITY THAT I LOVE AND INTO A NEW ENVIRONMENT WITH MANY UNKNOWNNS AND RISKS AS WELL AS NEW ADVENTURES AND OPPORTUNITIES. I WILL BE SERVING OUR COUNTRY IN A CULTURAL PROGRAM THAT WILL HAVE ME WORKING WITH OUR AMERICAN AMBASSADORS AS THEY GO ABROAD TO THEIR FOREIGN POSTS. AS DIRECTOR OF THE ART-IN-EMBASSIES PROGRAM IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT, I WILL BE

RESPONSIBLE FOR SHOWCASING AMERICAN ART IN OUR
AMERICAN EMBASSIES (ABROAD) . . . GIVING RESPECT AND
WELL-DESERVED EXPOSURE TO THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OUR
COUNTRY'S ARTISTS

I KNOW THERE WILL BE TIMES THAT I WILL FEEL
LONELY, HOWEVER, IT IS CERTAIN THAT I WILL DRAW UPON
THE MEMORIES OF THIS REWARDING EXPERIENCE TO GIVE ME
THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND CONFIDENCE AS I PURSUE THIS NEW
CAREER TRACK.

YOU MAY COUNT ON ME TO STAY CONNECTED AND
INVOLVED AND I WILL COUNT ON YOU TO STAY STRONG AND
CONTINUE TO GIVE TRUE MEANING TO THE WORDS. "TIKKUN
ALOM" AND "ACHARAI" REACH OUT AND REPAIR THE WORLD
AFTER ME, FOLLOW ME.

Cissie Swig, outgoing JCF head, joins Clinton team

SUZAN BURNS
Bulletin Correspondent

"The country will be getting a strong, compassionate executive who will undoubtedly fill her new position with the same energy, drive and captivating grace she has displayed in all her work here," said JCF executive vice president Wayne Feinstein, successor Doug Heller, will join the Clinton administration July 12.

In an interview at the Financial District offices of Roselyne C. Swig Artsource, a company she founded 15 years ago, she said she'd been offered the position in the nation's capital a year ago but asked for some extra time before taking the position.

"I explained that I could not be available until I completed my very important commitment to the federation, and they were kind enough to hold the job open for me," she explained.

A political appointment was not "out of my realm of interest," she said. "I've always directed part of my life to being involved in government and the political process."

At Artsource, where she is surrounded by modern art and photographs of family as well as herself with President Clinton and

former Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek, she has gained valuable experience providing corporate clients with art, Swig noted. In fact, she may have unknowingly laid the groundwork for her new job through that business.

What she'll be doing for the Clinton administration is direct the borrowing of artwork from museums and private collectors under the terms of a loan program first instituted 20 years ago.

See CISSIE, Page 16

Cissie Swig will head Clinton embassy art program

Continued from Page 1

full decade longer than that. In truth, she has served in a myriad of roles since she began volunteering as a young wife and mother. But in the last two years, Feinstein said, "she has helped us to set the agenda for the coming decade.

"Cissie urged the community forward by helping us to forge stronger linkages with agencies, synagogues and Israel. We had been moving in that direction, but with Cissie's leadership, we have taken giant steps forward."

Linkages, in particular bridge-building between the federation and the Jewish community at large, long have been high on Swig's list of priorities.

According to the Clinton appointee, examining her own motives, Jewishness and values early in her federation work — through JCF Women's Division group dynamics sessions — helped her develop those priorities, as well as many of the people skills she uses now.

"Those of us who participated literally put ourselves on the 'hot seat' and had pulled from us why we were doing what we were doing and what we hoped to achieve," she recalled, noting that Frances Green and Annette Dobbs, the only two other women JCF presidents, also were part of the group.

"The tools I got — how to interact, to share, to listen and value other opinions and feelings — and the clarification of my own sense of values, have been with me since then," Swig added.

During her tenure as federation president,



Roselyne "Cissie" Swig works in her San Francisco office while a photo of her posing with President Clinton sits on the desk.

recommendations, the first of which was to educate families as a whole, rather than children alone, to help promote Jewish continuity.

That strategy, noted Swig, will soon be implemented with the help of a JCF Endowment Fund grant.

Also, after planning sessions with JCF Women's Division members, new programming relevant to the needs and changing lifestyles of women has been undertaken. According to Swig, was five specific

a national crisis of Jewish identity and continuity when she assumed the top JCF post two years ago — although, in the Bay Area, "we had already realized we could not take for granted that our children would put a high priority on being Jewish because they have to. They had to want to."

The JCF's new community planning and leadership development initiatives all have been intended to respond to that realization, she said. "We must show that we, the Jewish community network, are interested in our young people, in what they want and need, and that we are prepared to offer something to them."

As for her own future, in less than a month Swig will find herself immersed in Washington, a new geography but familiar circumstances. "I'll spend my first weeks learning the job, establishing relationships and building bridges," she commented.

While there, Swig plans to continue her involvement with Jewish organizations. She already has accepted a new position on the board of the Joint Distribution Committee, will continue to work with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and plans to be active in the Washington Action Office of the Council of Jewish Federations.

Her work will involve traveling — how much is still unknown — but Swig has rented a house in Georgetown. When asked how she'll manage to spend time with her family and husband Richard, who next year will chair the JCF's annual campaign, she replied with her usual aplomb: "We'll just make it happen."

THE AMERICAN BENEFACTOR

PREMIER ISSUE

SPRING 1997

1997

IN THE PAST COUPLE of years, the biggest events in San Francisco were the openings of the new Museum of Modern Art and the Center for the Arts in

the formerly run-down Yerba Buena Gardens, located in the SoMa ("south of Market") district. San Francisco resident Rosalind Swig, the current director of the art-and-embassies program of the U.S. State Department, was one of the major forces in getting money for the museum, which was designed by Mario Botta and cost \$65 million.

Like many top fundraisers, Swig at first glance seems a surprisingly soft sell. A youthful, svelte presence with the occasional flashing smile, she sits ramrod straight, like a Victorian hostess presiding at a tea party. For the past four decades, she has been a prime fundraiser for a wide range of projects on the West Coast, in addition to running her own art-consulting firm for 18 years.

"The best fundraiser is someone who has already given," she says. As the wife of Richard Swig, owner of the Fairmont, one of San Francisco's largest hotels, and him self a prominent philanthropist, she has been in a position to do just that. "I would never send out a person who hasn't already given a gift to solicit someone else."

Swig, whose parents emigrated from Eastern Europe at the turn of the century, grew up in Chicago, then moved with her family to the West Coast and attended Berkeley. She spent her entire adult life doing work for nonprofits. "I learned early on not to be afraid of being turned down," she says. "You can't personalize it—you're not asking for your own behalf, but for the cause."

Swig's main interests have been both social and arts-or-

iented museums, opera, ballet, and the symphony, welfare rescue and relief, support for women's causes (such as Mills College, Partners Ending Domestic Abuse, National Women's Legal Defense Program), and global affairs, specifically Israel and world Jewry.

Swig cautions fundraisers to do thorough research on an individual's financial capacity before asking for a donation. "If you know they have the capacity, ask for more money rather than less. But if it turns out they don't have it, that means you haven't done your homework properly. Institutions have to cultivate the largesse of their patrons, otherwise the IRS will take it in taxes."

WHEN IT BECAME clear in 1989 that the Boston Public Library—a magnificent McKim, Mead, and White building on Copley Square—was falling apart, Angela Brown Fischer chaired the first of a succession of extremely successful Literary Lights dinners (named for the distinctive iron lamps on the building's facade). She describes getting Bostonians to part with \$125 for their late nineteenth-century beaux-arts library as "a ticklish undertaking. Boston is conservative old money—it's said that they don't buy new clothes they inherit them."

In the 1980's, Mrs. Fischer, who divides her time between Boston, Providence, and Newport, also began fundraising for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, then faced with a huge deficit. "Insurance costs skyrocketed at the same time that

"THE BEST FUNDRAISER IS SOMEONE WHO HAS ALREADY GIVEN TO A CAUSE," SAYS SAN FRANCISCO'S ROSALIND SWIG.



Patriarch Richard Swig: 'He was just larger than life'

LESLIE KATZ
Bulletin Staff

In the pre-dawn darkness Thursday of last week, Rabbi Stephen Pearce got a phone call. His congregant and friend Richard Swig was in the last stages of life following a long battle with heart disease; the rabbi's presence was requested at the hospital.

When Pearce arrived at San Francisco's California Pacific

Medical Center, he found a deeply moving scene. Swig's wife, four children, grandchildren and close friends had gathered around his bedside. Tearfully, they hugged and touched him, holding and comforting each other as they bid goodbye to Swig and reminisced about his life.

"I walked away strengthened by that scene," said Pearce, rabbi of Congregation Emanu-El in San Francisco. "To witness a family pulling together with such deep devotion to the patriarch was touching. It was a tribute to him and to

the power of family."

Swig, chairman of the S.F.-based Fairmont Hotel Management Company and a philanthropist in both the general and Jewish communities, died just hours later at age 72. He had undergone a heart transplant approximately six weeks ago and appeared to be making steady progress before he died of a sudden infection.

"He left a formidable legacy of community involvement,

See HOTELIER, Page 14

Hotelier Richard Swig leaves legacy of philanthropy, family

Continued from Page 1
having served as trustee, chairman or board member of more than 40 charitable, professional and educational institutions.

"There are a few people I've met over my years in community work who are 'just larger than life,'" said Wayne Bernstein, executive vice president of the S.F.-based Jewish Community Federation. "He was one of them."

Swig had long been involved with the federation. In 1991, he and his wife of 47 years, Roselyne "Cissie" Swig, headed a mega-mission that took 350 Northern Californians to Israel just after the Gulf War. Later, he chaired the 1995 annual campaign.

"It takes a lot of time and effort for a volunteer to chair the annual campaign," Feinstein said. "He had the energy of a 30-year-old. He dove into it and did a great job."

Feinstein and others describe Swig as an impassioned motivator who guided others by example.

A recipient of numerous awards, including the Mahatma Gandhi Humanitarian Award, the Golda Meir Award and the City College of San Francisco's President's



Richard Swig

Award. "Dick was the kind of leader who would never ask you to do something he hadn't done himself," Feinstein said. "That's a critical distinguishing characteristic."

Naomi Lauter, executive director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee — in which Swig served as a national board member — has similar memories. "I'd listen when he'd be soliciting someone for something he

cared about, like the Jewish federation or a candidate coming to town," she said. "It was never, 'You do it. I don't need to do it.' He was always there doing it too."

In addition to AIPAC and the ICF, other Jewish organizations that benefited from Swig's leadership included Israel Bonds, the Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Museum San Francisco, American Friends of Hebrew University and the American Society for the Technion University-Israel Institute of Technology, which awarded him an honorary fellowship in 1995.

"He was very proud of his Jewishness and very much aware of [his] responsibility as a Jew to reach out to help others," his wife said. He shared his pride in his history and culture with friends in the general community. "I think they appreciated the values he lived by."

The Swig name — long associated with the posh Fairmont Hotel, where Swig served as a steward in 1946 and which the family is now trying to sell — is equally synonymous with community involvement and philanthropy



Photo — STEPHEN WILSON
Mourners carry Richard Swig's flag-draped casket at Sunday's funeral at Congregation Emanu-El.

Family members have long supported causes ranging from Democratic politics and the arts to education and the Jewish community.

In addition to Jewish causes, Swig supported secular organizations including the Coast Guard Foundation, Fromm Institute for Lifelong Learning, Leukemia Society of America, University of Santa Clara and University of San Francisco's McLaren School of Business.

But despite his far-reaching contributions, Swig preferred to shun the congratulatory spotlight, according to Pearce. "He didn't do it for reward or praise. He did it very quietly," the rabbi said. "He was a self-effacing man. He really only wanted to do his share in making life better for a whole lot of people."

Swig was born in Boston to the late Benjamin and Mae Swig. On a trip to San Francisco in 1945, the elder Swig, a real estate investor, purchased a hotel, sold it at a profit and bought the nearby Fairmont on Nob Hill. Thus began the Swigs' migration west and the family's prominent position in the hotel business.

After serving in the navy during World War II, Richard Swig, alongside his late brother Mel, began a decades-long career at the Fairmont, which became the jewel in the crown of the luxury hotel chain. At the hotel, where many employees affectionately called Swig "Papa" and where flags flew at half-staff for a week following his death, Swig had a hands-on approach to grand hus-

pitality, according to his son Rick.

"He did not live in an ivory tower," his son said. "He made it his business to be scrupulous about knowing what was happening in every department — not just with regard to dollars and cents but with regard to the health and welfare of each and every member of the staff."

At a funeral for Swig Sunday, well over 1,000 mourners packed the main flour of Congregation Emanu-El's sanctuary. Pearce led the memorial; among others who paid tribute to Swig were Emanu-El's Rabbi Helen Cohn, the Rev. John Schlegel, president of USF, and family members and friends.

In addition to wife Roselyne "Cissie" Swig and son Rick Swig, both of San Francisco, Swig is survived by daughter and son-in-law Susan and Richard Watkins of San Francisco, daughter Marjorie Swig of Greenbrae and daughter and son-in-law Carol and George Sedlack of Sun Valley, Idaho. He is also survived by brother-in-law Richard and wife Joan Danner of San Francisco; sister-in-law Tobey and husband Allen Moss of Los Angeles and sister-in-law Miriam Handel of Anaheim. He left behind 12 grandchildren, who knew him as "Poppy."

The family asks that contributions in Swig's name be made to the American Society for Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Attn. Jack Kadish, 870 Market St. #1222, S.F., CA 94102; the Jewish Museum San Francisco, 121 Stewart St., S.F., CA 94105, or the charity of your choice.

American Friends of The Hebrew University extend our heartfelt condolences to the beloved family of

Richard L. Swig

His leadership in the community, love of Israel and passion for life will serve as an inspiration to us all!

May his memory be a blessing

Leonard Cohn
Regional President

Daphna Nolly
Regional Director



The leadership and staff of the State of Israel Bonds organization mourn the passing of our dear friend and supporter Richard Swig of San Francisco. His life was a model of philanthropic and humanitarian devotion and he will be greatly missed.

A longtime friend of the Israel Bonds organization, his inspired leadership and generous support spurred our San Francisco campaign to new heights in raising investment funds for Israel's economic development.

In all areas of endeavor, Richard Swig set the standard to be emulated.

*We extend our heartfelt condolences to
Roselyne "Cissie" Swig and the entire family.*

Gideon Part
President

William Belzberg
Chairman of the Board

Burton P. Resnick
National Campaign Chairman

David B. Hermelin
International Chairman

Susan Weikers-Volchok
International Campaign Chairman

Michael Siegal
North American Campaign Chairman

Milton Jacobs
San Francisco General Chairman



 ISRAEL BONDS

Russian Jews now have a cultural home as well

By Roselyne C. Swig

AS I BEGIN MY JOURNEY to Russia and Israel, I ponder the celebration of the Jewish state's 50th birthday and the profound connection to those two countries.

Visiting St. Petersburg, I will be observing local Jewish cultural, educational and welfare programs that are responding to the needs of a growing community. In the process, I will be watching a network of Jewish professionals and volunteers at work.

I am particularly drawn to a program that trains Jewish men and women as professional communal workers, honing new skills they can use when they return to their own new republics. What is that program's relationship to Israel? Since the early '70s, the Jews



of Russia and the former Soviet Union have been leaving, both under cover and in the open. They have traded a life of suppression for a new homeland, new opportunities and newly acquired religious freedom.

The critical urgency to move Jews out of the politically uncomfortable environment in the Soviet Union has lessened, however. With the new perestroika, many emerging Jews of all ages have expressed a wish to build social, economic and Jewish cultural lives where they were born.

Why do I commit so much of my time, energy and resources to her development? Why do I feel so close to the state and its people? Because my late husband Richard, and I, my children and grandchildren are part of her biblical and modern history. Our lives, our values and our memories are strengthened and enriched by her existence.

But I also feel pain from her traumatic events I am especially sad about the tragic and unreasonable loss of lives

and the inability to transcend the socio/politico/religious dilemmas now clouding progress toward peace.

In June, I will return to Israel with my second-oldest grandchild, Adam Swig, 13. He will be the second to participate in our family's new tradition of visiting Israel with grandparents after a bar or bat mitzvah. The first was his brother Benjamin, now 16, and, God willing, by the time all our grandchildren have reached age 13, I will have made that trip 12 times.

I hope that for those young children, it will be the beginning of an awareness of the special relationship the family of Jews enjoys with each other and with the State of Israel.

I hope, too, that they will understand the extraordinary responsibility each of us has to assure her existence.

Roselyne C. Swig is past president of the Jewish Community Federation, a civic activist and philanthropist.

Roselyn 'Cissie' Swig tapped for U.S.-Israel commission

ALEXANDRA J. WALL
Bulletin Staff

San Franciscan Roselyn "Cissie" Swig has been chosen to serve in a new cooperative effort between Israel and the United States to improve public housing. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo tapped 20 American Jews for the newly formed U.S.-Binational Commission on Housing and Community Development.

Those who were chosen have expertise in the areas of building construction, housing finance, real estate, economic development, banking, academia, labor relations, non-governmental organizational development, land use and urban planning and private-public sector cooperation.

Members of this commission will aim to improve affordable housing in both countries, help increase home ownership, create jobs and help businesses to expand as part of an effort to revitalize communities. In addition, they will work to improve construction technology and architecture to allow housing to be built at a higher quality and a lower cost.

Swig, who comes from the San Francisco real estate and hotel family, is a former president of the S.F.-based Jewish Community Federation. She said that while she has no expertise in housing and development, she does have "an overview as an interested person with strong relationships in Israel," as well as a good understanding of the country and what its housing

needs are.

Because of the massive influx of immigrants from throughout the world in a relatively short period, Swig said, "In many cases, Israel didn't have the opportunity to do a lot of strategic planning and development."

"I think they are doing a better job of that now, and are looking forward to getting the input and advice from experts in the field that could help them for the future," she added. In June 2000, President Bill Clinton directed Cuomo to visit Israel and work to create the commission. During that visit, Cuomo signed an agreement to create it with then-Israeli Construction and Housing Minister Yitzhak Levy.

"These new commission members represent some of



Roselyn "Cissie" Swig

the best thinking on housing and economic development in America," Cuomo said in a statement. "With this kind of talent, we have a tremendous opportunity to advance U.S.-Israeli cooperation in areas of deep concern to both our countries. The challenges of housing and community development are great — and there is much we can learn from each other."

Swig said she was unsure of the required time commitment, but added, "I'm very happy to have been invited to serve." "It's one more opportunity to help with Israel's future," she continued. "The sharing that goes on between experts in any field is reflective of the friendship and relationship that the U.S. has with Israel, and just one more strengthening of the bond."

SA

JEWISH BULLETIN ■ DECEMBER 8, 2000

169

INDEX--Roselyne C. Swig

- Amuta. See Jewish Community Federation
- American Public Affairs Committee, 89-90
- Art Table, 98-99
- awards, 105-107
- Burstein, Beth Edelstein, 8
- Bitterman, Mary. See KQED
- Berns, Arthur, 97
- Council of Jewish Federations, 33, 45, 66, 67
- Cook, Phyllis, 61, 79, 85-87, 88-89
- Cummings, Nathan, 97-98
- California State Summer School for the Arts, 99
- California Insurance Commission, Advisory Board, 103
- California-Israel Exchange, Governor's Advisory Board, 104
- Dobbs, Annette, 17, 30
- Folkman, Susan, Ph.D., 58, 60, 72, 83
- Feinstein, Wayne, 64-65, 66-68, 72, 79, 83
- Friedman, Anita, 77
- Federal Reserve Board, Fine Arts Committee, 97-98
- Frankel, Diane, 98
- Foreign Diplomatic Travel Program, 105
- Green, Frances, 14, 17
- Goley, Mary Ann, 97
- Heller, Douglas, 83
- Holmgren, Janet, 103
- Hellman, Warren, 103
- Israel, 35-50
- Law of Return, 39
 - Operation Exodus, 39-41, 69
 - Operation Solomon, 39
 - OTZMA. See Jewish Community Federation
 - relationship with diaspora, 42-43
 - State of Israel Bond Organization, 49, 59
 - Swig family involvement, 48-50
- Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, 13, *passim*
- allocations of funds, 43-45
 - Amuta, 23, 38, 39
 - budget committee, 19-20
 - community development department, 58-61, 66
 - demographic study, 51-52
 - designated giving, 44-45, 75
 - fundraising, 15-16, 23, 26-27, 53-54, 72
 - Jewish continuity, 82-83
 - loan guarantee program, 46
 - missions, 26-27, 46, 69
 - OTZMA, 41-42
 - Partnership 2000, 38
 - Project Renewal, 28-30, 37-38
 - strategic planning committee, 52-58, 82
 - synagogue, relations to, 58-61, 82
 - Women's Division, 13-18, 32, 77, 78, 80
 - women's issues, 32, 76, 78, 79. See also Jewish Women's Conference

- Jewish Community Endowment Fund, 61-62
- Jewish Family and Children's Agency, 73, 77-78
- Jewish Home for the Aged, 74
- Jewish Community Center, San Francisco, 74
- Jewish Women's Conference, 79-80
- Joint Distribution Committee, 90-91
- Jewish Agency for Israel, 22-25, 36, 37, 38, 85-87
- Jewish Vocational Service, 20, 74
- Jewish Museum San Francisco, 88
- KQED, 62-63
- Kefauver, Nancy, 95
- Lurie, Rabbi Brian, 21-22, 41, 64
- Mount Zion Hospital, 11
- Myers, Laurence, 82
- Mills College, 102-103
- Metz, Mary, 103
- National Foundation of Jewish Culture, 33
- Netanyahu, Benjamin, 35, 39
- Project Renewal. See Jewish Community Federation
- Partners Ending Domestic Abuse, 79
- Rothenberg, Alan, 65, 72
- Swig family:**
- Sedlack, Carol Swig, daughter, 10, 12
 - Swig, Benjamin, father-in-law, 48
 - Swig, Marjorie, daughter, 10
- Swig family (cont'd.)
- Swig, Melvin, brother-in-law, 49
 - Swig, Rich, son, 10
 - Swig, Richard, husband, 7-9, 47, 49, 105
 - Watkins, Susan Swig, daughter, 10
- Swig, Roselyn C. Artsource, 92-94
- Stone, Sylvia, 11
- Sacred Heart School, 12
- Seiler, Donald, 56, 79, 82
- San Francisco Art Institute, 92
- San Francisco Art Commission, 92
- San Francisco Opera Association, 96-97
- San Francisco Public Library Commission, 100
- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, 100-101
- San Francisco Foundation, 104
- Treguboff, Sanford, 21
- Tiano, Tony. See KQED
- Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 89
- United Jewish Appeal, 22-23, 36, 85-87, 89, 91
- Uzbekistan, 69-70
- U.S. State Department Art in Embassies Program, 94-98
- University Art Museum, Berkeley, 100-101
- University of California Berkeley Foundation, 101
- Weinstein, Louis, 21
- World Zionist Organization, 37-38
- Wornick, Ron, 52-53
- Wexner Foundation, 67
- Zlot, Harold, 103
- Zipser, Richard, 72, 83-84

Eleanor K. Glaser

Raised and educated in the Middle West. During World War II, spent two years in U.S. Marine Corps Women's Reserve.

Senior year of college was taken in New Zealand, consequently A.B. degree in sociology from University of Michigan was granted in absentia. Study in New Zealand was followed by a year in Sydney, Australia, working for Caltex Oil Company.

Work experience includes such nonprofit organizations as Community Service Society, New York City; National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and National Congress of Parents and Teachers in Chicago.

After moving to California in 1966, joined the staff of a local weekly newspaper, did volunteer publicity for the Judah Magnes Museum and the Moraga Historical Society, and was the Bay Area correspondent for a national weekly newspaper. Also served as a history docent for the Oakland Museum.

Joined the staff of the Regional Oral History Office in 1976 as interviewer/editor. Currently director of the Jewish Community Federation Leadership Oral History Project.

BANC
MSS
2002/57
c

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C074222259

